DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 527	PS 006 868

AUTHOR	Caylor, Florence Byrens
TITLE	Contemporary Practices and Problems in Music Education in the Elementary Public Schools of the United States: A Survey and Study.
PUB DATE	Jul 73
NOTE	375p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, Walden University
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$13.16
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *Curriculum Problems; Educational Objectives; Educational Philosophy; *Elementary School Curriculum; Instructional Innovation; *Music Education; Questionnaires; *School Surveys; Tables (Data); *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This status study investigated elementary school music education in the United States in 1972 as reflected in: (1) the opinions and attitudes of practicing music educators in representative districts throughout the nation; (2) the literature and publications of music educators; and (3) the opinions of elementary school administrators. Information was gathered using a random sample questionnaire, observations of elementary classroom music and instrumental training, a study of interests and trends in professional publications, and personal interviews. Appendices include statistical information. (JET)

ED 087527

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CONTEMPORARY PRACTICES AND PROBLEMS IN MUSIC EDUCATION IN THE ELEMENTARY PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE UNITED STATES: A SURVEY AND STUDY

By

Florence Byrens Caylor

B. Ed., University of California at Los Angeles, 1930
M. S. in Ed., University of Southern California, 1933

Abraham A. Schwadron

Abraham A. Schwadron, Mus. A. D., Advisor
Professor of Music
University of California at Los Angeles

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Walden University
July, 1973

PS 006868

Advisor's Approval

WALDEN UNIVERSITY

This doctoral dissertation has been completed under advisement of:

Name: ABRAHAM A. SCHWADRON

Degree held: MUS. A.D.

Present position: PROFESSOR of MUSIC

Address: University of California, at Los Angeles

Signature: Abraham A. Schwadron

Date: May 29, 1973

ABSTRACT

CONTEMPORARY PRACTICES AND PROBLEMS IN MUSIC EDUCATION IN THE ELEMENTARY PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE UNITED STATES: A SURVEY AND STUDY

By

Florence Byrens Caylor

B. Ed., University of California at Los Angeles, 1930
M. S. in Ed., University of Southern California, 1933

Abraham A. Schwadron

Abraham A. Schwadron, Mus. A. D., Advisor
Professor of Music
University of California at Los Angeles

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Walden University
July, 1973

ABSTRACT

The survey was designed to serve as an initial step in needed status studies of contemporary music education programs in the elementary schools of the United States.

The firm position held by music in the elementary school curriculum as reported in the 1961-62 survey of the research division of the National Education Association was not in evidence in the 1972 survey. Curtailment of elementary music education in the latter study was found attributable to much more than financial problems. Music educators and elementary school administrators agreed on many of the basic problems.

According to the data revealed by the same study, neither of two important elementary music education recommendations of the Music Educators National Conference (July, 1972) are currently predominant: (1) that the minimum amount of time for music in the classroom be 90 minutes per week, and (2) that elementary classroom music be taught by a specialist in music.

Still significantly related to a number of problems was the size of the school district; problems new to the largest districts have developed. The data revealed that contemporary concepts of philosophy were nebulous and innovative music programs were myriad and lacking in common bases. Music reading was stated to be taught by a large majority of the respondents, but the methods by which it was taught were varied and unrelated to stated goals. The largest strides revealed by the data were made in the development of instrumental training and choral programs.

CONTEMPORARY PRACTICES AND PROBLEMS IN MUSIC EDUCATION IN THE ELEMENTARY PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE UNITED STATES: A SURVEY AND STUDY

By

Florence Byrens Caylor

B. Ed., University of California at Los Angeles, 1930

M. S. in Ed., University of Southern California, 1933

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of
The Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Walden University
July, 1973

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The investigator wishes to express sincerest appreciation to David Kimble for statistical and computer assistance in tabulating the data of this survey, to Linda Marchenko for invaluable assistance in typing this study, to Drs. John Vincent and Harold Hodgkinson for their continuous support and assistance, and to Dr. Abraham A. Schwadron for penetrating analysis and constructive suggestions in the preparation of this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES vi

TABLES IN THE APPENDIXES vii

Chapter

I. THE PROBLEM 1

Statement of the Problem 8

Need for the Study 11

Scope of the Study 21

Summary 23

II. ELEMENTARY MUSIC EDUCATION, 1950-1972 25

The Trends 28

Prevailing Attitudes 50

Innovative Programs in Elementary Music Education . . . 54

The Program of Carl Orff 54

The Program of Zoltán Kodály 60

The Program of Shinichi Suzuki 68

CMP (Contemporary Music Project) 76

MMCP (Manhattanville Music Curriculum Project) . . . 80

YMC (Yale Music Curriculum) 83

CEMREL (Central Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Inc.) 84

JRL (Juilliard Repertory Library) 85

Page

The Hawaii Curriculum Center Music Project 86
Music Education in Television 89
Summary 95
III. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 96
Music Education 97
Educational Psychology 116
Psychology of Music 127
Aesthetic Education in Music 135
Summary 139
IV. THE SURVEY: PROCEDURE AND RESULTS 141
Analysis of Problems 149
The Questionnaire 152
The Hypotheses 152
Results of the Questionnaire 155
Organization of the Data 168
Interpretation of the Data: Sets of Tables, "A" and "B" 170
Questions Related to Public Schools of the United States 171
Questions Related to the Basic Philosophies of the Music Program 173
Questions Related to Financial Assistance for the Music Program 191
Questions Related to the Music Teacher in the Elementary Classroom 196

Page

Questions Related to Music Instruction in the Elementary Schools 199

Questions Regarding Primary Goals as Related to Other Factors 223

Interviews with Elementary Administrators 231

Results of the Interviews 232

Summary 241

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 251

Conclusions 254

Recommendations 258

APPENDIX A, Schools in the Districts 261

APPENDIX B, Basic Philosophy of the Music Education Program . . 264

APPENDIX C, Financial Assistance for the Music Program 281

APPENDIX D, The Music Teacher in the Elementary Classroom . . . 288

APPENDIX E, Music Instruction in the Elementary Schools 292

APPENDIX F, Primary Goals as Related to Other Factors 321

APPENDIX G, Interviews with Elementary Administrators 337

APPENDIX H, The Questionnaire 346

BIBLIOGRAPHY 348

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Number of Operating Local Public School Systems, by Grade Span and Size of Systems, for the United States: Fall, 1970-71	144
2.	Tabulation of Operating School Districts in the United States	146
3.	Distribution: Questionnaire Returns According to Number of Schools in the District	158
4.	Respondents' Voluntary Remarks Regarding Their Programs	162
5.	Comparison of Respondents' Primary and Secondary Goals	178
6.	Allotted Time and Frequency for Elementary Classroom Music	201
7.	Weekly Time Reported for Instrumental Training Classes	213
8.	Administrators' Opinions Regarding Elementary Music Education (1972)	236

TABLES IN THE APPENDIXES*

APPENDIX A:	SCHOOLS IN THE DISTRICTS		
TABLES:	A 1.1	B 1.1	Initial public instruction
	A 1.2	B 1.2	Initial music instruction
APPENDIX B:	BASIC PHILOSOPHY OF THE MUSIC EDUCATION PROGRAM		
TABLES:	A 2.1	B 2.1	Educational philosopher as model
	A 2.2		Music program models
	A 3.1		Philosopher in music as model
	A 4.1		Music education philosophies reported
	A 4.2		Stresses in the basic philosophies
	A 5.1		Primary goals of the music programs
	A 6.1		Secondary goals of the music programs
	A 7.1	B 7.1	Composite of primary and secondary goals
		B 7.2	Analysis of primary and secondary goals
	A 8.1	B 8.1	The innovative programs reported
	A 8.2		Different ideas of innovation
	A 8.3	B 8.3	Basis for innovative ideas
	A 9.1	B 9.1	Need to upgrade the music program
	A 9.2		Specific ways to upgrade the music program
	A 9.3		Number of different ideas called innovative
APPENDIX C:	FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE MUSIC PROGRAM		
TABLES:	A 10.1	B 10.1	Subsidized music programs

---

*All "A" tables in the appendixes chart the raw data; all "B" tables chart the statistical analysis.

A 10.2 Kinds of grants
A 10.3 B 10.3 Grants still functioning
A 10.4 Grants discontinued
A 11.1 B 11.1 Needs for financial assistance in music education
A 11.2 B 11.2 Priorities for needs

APPENDIX D: THE MUSIC TEACHER IN THE ELEMENTARY CLASSROOM

TABLES: A 12.1 B 12.1 The teacher of classroom music
A 12.2 B 12.2 The classroom teacher's music helper

APPENDIX E: MUSIC INSTRUCTION IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

TABLES: A 13.1 Music in the elementary classroom
A 13.2 Frequency of the lessons
A 13.3 B 13.3 Time allotments, weekly basis
A 14.1 Elementary textbooks in use
A 15.1 B 15.1 Recordings correlated with texts
A 15.2 Audio-visual materials
A 16.1 B 16.1 Music reading in the classroom
A 16.2 Methods of teaching music reading
A 17.1 B 17.1 Grade for beginning music reading
A 17.2 B 17.2 Frequency of music reading lessons
A 18.1 B 18.1 Instrumental training in elementary schools
A 18.2 Grade for beginning instrumental training
A 18.3 B 18.3 Plans for instrumental training
A 18.4 Grades for different instruments
A 18.5 Method for selecting instrument
A 19.1 Methods for instrumental training

A 19.2 The teacher of instrumental training

A 19.3 B 19.3 Time allotment for instrumental training

A 20.1 B 20.1 The string program in the elementary school

A 20.2 The elementary teacher of string instruments

A 20.3 Grade for beginning the string program

A 20.4 B 20.4 The orchestra in the elementary school

A 20.5 Orchestra and band in elementary compared

A 21.1 B 21.1 The band program in the elementary school

A 21.2 B 21.2 Frequency of band rehearsals

A 21.3 B 21.3 Frequency of band performances

A 22.1 B 22.1 The choral program in the elementary school

A 22.2 B 22.2 Grade for beginning the choral program

A 22.3 Choral performances

A 22.4 B 22.4 Frequency of choral performances

APPENDIX F: PRIMARY GOALS AS RELATED TO OTHER FACTORS

TABLES: A 23.1 Primary goals/State texts

A 24.1 B 24.1 Primary goals/Teacher of classroom music

A 24.2 Primary goals/Special music teacher

A 24.3 Primary goals/Music supervisor

A 24.4 Primary goals/Music coordinator

A 24.5 Primary goals/Other help

A 25.1 B 25.1 Primary goals/Music reading

A 25.2 Primary goals/Methods for music reading

A 26.1 B 26.1 Primary goals/Instrumental training

A 26.2 B 26.2 Primary goals/Instrumental training grades

A 26.3 B 26.3 Primary goals/Plan for different instruments

A 26.4 Primary goals/Grade instrumental training starts
A 27.1 B 27.1 Primary goals/String program
A 27.2 B 27.2 Primary goals/String teacher
A 27.3 B 27.3 Primary goals/Elementary orchestra

APPENDIX G: INTERVIEWS WITH ELEMENTARY ADMINISTRATORS

TABLES: A 28.1 Interview sheet
A 29.1 The elementary administrators' positions
A 29.2 Responsibilities of administrators
A 29.3 Agreement with thesis statement
A 30.1 Composite of administrators' positions
A 30.2 Composite of administrators' responsibilities
A 30.3 Composite of agreement with thesis statement
A 31.1 Elementary administrators' statements of opinion
A 32.1 Elementary administrators' answers to questions and agreement with thesis statement

APPENDIX H: THE QUESTIONNAIRE

(No tables)

ERRATA SHEET

The following errors are recognized and noted:

1. Page 108, excessive margin at the bottom of the page.
2. Page 145, excessive margin at the bottom of the page.
3. Page 157, excessive margin at the bottom of the page.
4. Page 161, excessive margin at the bottom of the page.
5. Page 200, excessive margin at the bottom of the page.
6. Page 212, excessive margin at the bottom of the page.
7. Page 235, excessive margin at the bottom of the page.

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Music education is a vital part of the total learning picture, subject to the same environmental conditioning, the same stresses and strains as all other areas of learning. In an age in which man has become the victim of his own inventiveness, in which the computer has changed his name to a number, and the machine, instead of liberating him, has tended to restrain and restrict him, two things become imperative: (1) to utilize to the fullest possible extent the inherent values in the creative arts, and (2) to continuously reevaluate and analyze the status of the dynamic development of music education in terms of concomitant relationships.

What has happened to elementary music education? Many varied yet pertinent questions are being asked today. Is it true that it has dramatically declined, either in quantity, quality, or in both during the past twenty years? Is it a fact that the general elementary classroom teacher is less adequately prepared to teach music in the classroom than she was before 1950? Why has there been such tremendous cutback of music specialists at elementary levels? Is it a fact that sixth grade graduates today have less understanding and skill in music than they had twenty years ago?

Music education in the classroom, like all other areas of learning in our public schools, has changed. But the questions are: In what direction has it changed? Is it influenced by the thinking and the creative work of professional musicians now in education? Have there been changes in the fundamental goals, the basic aims of elementary music education? Are there changes in many directions or only in one? Is there agreement among the music educators themselves regarding the most effective direction that elementary music education could take?

In the early '60s, the findings of two National Education Association surveys indicated that there was "little cause to worry that music will disappear from the schools. Music still holds a firm place in both elementary and secondary curriculums.... The trend is toward more music in public schools, rather than less."[1] Are the cutbacks today, then, restricted to certain areas of the United States? The reduction in the number of music specialists in elementary music has long been noted and deplored by music educators, by professional musicians, by leading music critics, and as well by officials of public education.

Martin Bernheimer, critic for the Los Angeles Times, recently cited the music situation in the Los Angeles elementary schools:

> It is true that our city system still does manage to employ 92--count them, 92--music teachers. But that seems like a bad joke when one remembers that we also have 334,318 students. It comes out to something like one music teacher for every 3,633 pupils.... When budgets have to be cut, music has to go.[2]

Wilson Riles, superintendent of public instruction in California, noted the decline in his 1971 foreword to the booklet for music educators, Music Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve:

---

[1] "Music in the Public Schools," Digest of NEA Monograph, Perspectives in Music Education: Source Book III, (Washington, D. C.: MENC, 1966), p. 204.

[2] Martin Bernheimer, "Music Education and the Underprivileged Majority," Los Angeles Times, Calendar Section, January 21, 1973, p. 1.

> Too often the public schools of California, confronted as they have been with great financial problems, have dropped music programs to make budgets balance. The deficit that this has caused, however, in the spiritual resources of children who have been deprived of musical experiences can never be recovered. Perhaps never before in our history, has it been so important to give our children a sense of beauty and mystery of life and nature. In a world where life is hectic and mechanized, music is an inexhaustible source of refreshment, inspiration, and fulfillment to the individual who has come to know and treasure the musical experience.[3]

The United States of America, as a democratic society, has struggled continuously to bring equal educational opportunities to all. In this endeavor, it has brought to bear the judicial branches of government, the legislative, as well as the executive branches. Its educational leadership has fought for quality as well as equality in education, and with it all, there has been a constant criticism of both the means and ends of education, nationally. Much of this criticism was justified but could not be truly evaluated unless related to the concomitantly confused state of world and national affairs, of human relations, of both scientific and economic competition, and to the entire cultural upheaval of the comparatively recent past. Epitaphs are now being written for the Great Society of the '60s which died aborting government solutions to national problems in the areas of poverty, welfare, education, ecology, labor, and civil rights. Yet it was at that same time, when the world was changing at such a rapidly increasing rate that it forced many thinkers to pause and to warn us of the implications. Suffice it to state that change, including rate of change, is one of the most pragmatic concerns of this generation. Has the nature of the egalitarian society in a rapidly changing world been a factor in the changes in the elementary music program as it has been in other areas of education?

---

[3] Wilson Riles, Foreword to Music Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve, California State Department of Education, (Sacramento, California: Office of State Printing, 1971).

While it is true that on a national scale many of the new ideas and so-called innovational programs have neither solved nor resolved major concerns regarding poverty, welfare, education, etc., it is also true that we are beginning to take a more realistic look at the federal government and the ways in which it can hope to carry out its activities effectively. Similarly, educators in general education are viewing their goals more realistically in terms of national developments in the search for better means to achieve desired goals. All education, under deep scrutiny, has been moving in new directions. The '60s saw a rush of activities that immediately outmoded methods and procedures of previous decades. How did this affect elementary music education? The '70s are already demonstrating new evidence of scrutiny of government support of educational needs. Is elementary music education conscious of new threats and new developments nationally?

Today, in the United States, there seems to be little or no disagreement on the importance of music in the total educational program of boys and girls. Perhaps mere lip service is being paid. Surely published materials and public statements of many well-known educators offer sufficient support that the importance of musical training is widely accepted. While administrators' resolutions have consistently extolled the values of music education for all children,[4] actual realization of programs to nurture desirable musical results is something else again.

With regard to the long-range goals of music education itself, there also seems to be little or no disagreement. Reflecting the great American dream of affording each and every individual the right to help improve his American culture by improving himself, is the 1923 phrase of Karl Gehrkins: "music for every child, every child for music," used ever since as a motto by the Music Educators National Conference. How to realize this goal in the elementary classroom still remains a problem. In an ever-changing society that so clearly reflects a plurality of values, it is logical to find that same plurality in thinking that can only result in a wide variety of music programs in the elementary schools of the nation; such programs need to be studied, analyzed, and understood.

Understanding the kinds of music education programs existing today in districts of all sizes seems to bring with it realization of another and more complex problem: often the music program observed in the classroom differs radically from that described in the course outline. Frequently there seems to be a great deal of difference between theory and practice. The philosophies, the goals, the course outlines are all orderly in appearance; copies of these are available from many sources ranging from state boards of education down to local and district boards. But what do those who are most acquainted with the actual practice of elementary music education have to say about their own programs? Why is there a difference between theory and practice? How [illegible] these music educators state their own ideas, their application of a [illegible]sic education philosophy, their own direction as to goals, their own statements of needs in elementary music education? Are these practicing music educators following or even familiar with the comprehensive set of goals and objectives developed by the Music Educators National Conference in 1970?[5] To what extent are these evidenced in their programs? Are they in agreement with such educational philosophers in music education as Bennett Reimer, who states that the major goal of the general music program is increasing aesthetic sensitivity to music?[6] What is the relationship between their philosophy and their musical activities? Does this relationship reflect an agreement with Abraham Schwadron who believes that all musical activity should be "rooted in the search for musical understanding and aesthetic significance." Schwadron states that: "It is the task of music education to demonstrate that true and meaningful musical exhilarations are directly proportionate to musical understandings."[7] He very seriously doubts that the general classroom teacher is adequately prepared in necessary musicianship to provide a meaningful musical program for children.

---

[4] An example is the resolution passed by the American Association of School Administrators at Atlantic City, New Jersey, in February, 1959.

---

[5] "Goals and Objectives for Music Education," Music Educators Journal, December, 1970, p. 23 ff.

[6] Bennett Reimer, A Philosophy of Music Education, Contemporary Perspectives in Music Education, (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970), p. 122.

[7] Abraham A. Schwadron, "In Defense of the Special Music Teacher," Music Educators Journal, September-October, 1965, p. 64.

A look at the picture of general education reveals a tremendous surge of exploration, experimentation, and study regarding the "how" of learning. The works of Jean Piaget and Jerome Bruner offer outstanding examples of such investigation, and there is no question but that a great deal of recommended reform in education is based upon their thinking. John Holt has even produced popular best sellers in his How Children Learn[8] and How Children Fail.[9] Has this influenced the thinking of the practicing music educator or his elementary music program?

Studies in contemporary educational psychology have resulted in new knowledge pointing to present needs of elementary pupils; contemporary trends in psychology represent "a powerful movement away from the reactive image toward the creative image."[10] Is this new body of knowledge regarding children's needs a part of planning in music education on the elementary level?

In the United States, articles repeatedly appear regarding the cultural needs of society, for example, the dearth of string players for future symphonies, the lack of audience support for the serious music of the country, the lack of empathy and understanding for the musical expressiveness of youth, etc. To what extent are these expressions of need reflected in the thinking of those responsible for the actual practice of elementary music education? Just where does the responsibility for the musical education of elementary school children lie? With the elementary classroom teacher? With the music specialist? With the Music Educators National Conference? Or with the elementary administrator? What modes of interrelationships are most desirable for what purpose?

---

[8] John Holt, How Children Learn, (New York: Pitman Publishing Co., 1967).

[9] John Holt, How Children Fail, (New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1970).

[10] Howard E. Gruber, "Education and the Image of Man," in Richard M. Jones, Ed., Contemporary Educational Psychology, (New York: Harper and Row, 1967), p. 91.

The position of elementary music education within the framework of the cultural needs of this nation and within the framework of the national trends in general elementary education needs to be carefully scrutinized. The position of elementary music education in terms of goals and objectives declared by the Music Educators National Conference needs to be carefully examined. New and stimulating ideas emerging in the field of elementary music education need to be reexamined in terms of national education as well as musical goals.

In recent years, many elementary music educators have been introduced to a number of innovative programs. Some of these programs developed abroad and have been adapted to the needs of American children; others have been developed in the United States. To what extent are they generally known and to what extent are they being used in the elementary schools of the United States?

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate and analyze contemporary practices and problems in elementary music education in the United States as reflected in the opinions and attitudes of elementary music teachers and elementary administrators. It was the subpurpose of this research to:

1. Determine the attitudes, philosophies, goals, and programs of practicing music educators in districts of various sizes in the United States.
2. Survey a representative group of elementary administrators in order to determine their attitudes and opinions regarding the status and problems of elementary music education.
3. Analyze the findings as related to:
   a. Contemporary views expressed by educators, philosophers, and psychologists in elementary education.
   b. Attitudes and actions of the Music Educators National Conference as reported in MENC publications.
4. Synthesize the findings in terms of specific problems in elementary music education as revealed by the study.
5. Suggest possible action for solutions to existing problems.

The following questions served to guide the scope and design of the research:

1. Is the philosophy of elementary music education, as expressed by practicing music educators, related to contemporary educational philosophy and psychology, or to the contemporary philosopher in music education? Is there any relationship between stated philosophy and stated goals, the programs, or the size of the school district?

2. Who, today, is actually doing the teaching of classroom music in the elementary schools? Is it the classroom teacher herself? The music consultant? The special music teacher? The music coordinator? The music supervisor? A combination of these?
3. Are there differences in the kinds of music programs that can be related to "who" teaches the music?
4. What constitutes the curriculum in music education at the elementary level?
    a. Is music reading stressed? If so, by what method(s)?
    b. Is instrumental training taught during school hours?
    c. Are there band, string, and choral programs? Are there public performances?
    d. How are the instrumental and choral programs related to the general classroom program?
5. Are the elementary schools able to finance their own musical needs and music programs locally or do they need grants and additional aid?
    a. Where there has been federal funding of music programs, has the program been able to continue when such funds were no longer available?
6. How do music educators express the musical needs of their children and the significance of their programs?

This study seeks to discover not only what is actually happening in the elementary classroom, in both general (sometimes called vocal) and instrumental music, but also what the elementary music educators themselves think about their programs. It searches for the answers to the listed questions by three means: (1) a survey of practicing elementary music educators across the nation, (2) a study of critical professional publications in elementary music education, and (3) reports of personal interviews with elementary administrators in relation to their own music programs. It hopes to be able to report the attitudes of those practicing music educators who may be rarely contributing to the literature of elementary music education, who may be rarely heard at the conferences of music educators, but who, nonetheless, are directly responsible for the musical education of children in elementary schools across the nation.

Need for the Study

A thorough search of the subject matter of research, educational surveys, experimentation, and doctoral dissertations reveals very little evidence of study (within the last eight years) related to such comprehensive yet specific questions on music in the elementary schools as those listed previously. Doctoral dissertations reported for the years 1968-71 are, for the most part, devoted to the college or to the high school level.[11] Many concern teacher training. Approximately 30 studies are listed under various headings on the elementary level;

---

[11] "Doctoral Dissertations in Music and Music Education, 1968-71," Journal of Research in Music Education, Spring, 1972, Volume 20, No. 1.

very few of those are in any way related to the scope of the subject matter under investigation in this study. Some concern in-service training; some a specific subject taught in elementary music education; a few are concerned with the child (deprived, advantaged, etc.); some are concerned with correlation and interaction; many are concerned with particular areas of learning in music education or particular grade level skills and developments in elementary music education. Such research tends to be somewhat categorically inclined: teaching third grade music through keyboard experiences; pitch discrimination performance in elementary school children; sixth grade correlation of music with geography; instructional music methods in the elementary schools of ____________ County; influence of teaching music reading skills on the development of basic reading skills in primary grades; etc.

Certainly many exemplar research studies of intrinsic value to elementary music education may be found. Some, although in no way related to the scope of this study are, nonetheless, very important to an understanding of phases of the study and further serve to help categorize some of the responses to the questionnaire. To cite a few:

1. Robert G. Petzold did extensive research on the perception of musical symbols in music reading, identifying the differences between children of both average and above average musical ability. He found no significant differences between the sexes nor between the fourth and sixth grade levels, but he did find very significant differences between those children of average and those children of above average talents in

music. Musically-gifted children read music three to four times as rapidly as those of lesser talents. His study also tended to support the point of view that a higher level of music reading competence depends upon providing children with activities which will enable them to understand and use the concepts underlying notation.[12]

2. Another important study done by Petzold concerned the nature and development of certain fundamental music skills; it focused on aural perception as an integral factor in the child's musical development. Complex melodies, rhythmic, and harmonic items were found to be difficult for young children and, to some degree, for the older children as well. Results of the study indicated that the ability to imitate the presentation of certain musical ideas is not a measure of the understanding of such ideas.[13]

3. Marilyn Pflederer has done a series of five experiments designed for and administered to 679 elementary and junior high school students over a two-year period (1966-68) to test the relevance of Piaget's concept of conservation (in musical learning). Her results indicated that:

---

[12] Robert G. Petzold, "The Perception of Music Symbols in Music Reading by Normal Children and by Children Gifted Musically," (Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), Project No. 554, ED 002 899, January-June, 1959.

[13] Robert G. Petzold, "Auditory Perception of Musical Sounds by Children in the First Six Grades," (Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), Project No. 5-0202, ED 010 297, August, 1960-July, 1965.

a. The task performance progressively improved from younger to older age groups.

b. Improvement in conservation of tonal patterns preceded improvement in conservation of rhythm patterns.

c. Training to enhance conservation was most effective between the ages of five and seven.

d. Change of mode, contour, and rhythm pattern interfered with conservation more than change of instrument, tempo, or the addition of harmony.

e. A plateau of music conservation skills was reached at about the fourth grade.

f. Patterns in minor mode produced better rhythmic conservation than major or atonal patterns.

g. The initial teaching of musical structure may best be pursued through the study of familiar music.

Generally speaking, her conclusions emphasize the importance of an early acquaintance with basic music structure and vocabulary.[14]

4. Frances M. Andrews and Ned C. Diehl developed an instrument to identify ideas regarding pitch, duration, and loudness as possessed by children. They felt that there was little understanding of children's concepts of basic musical

---

[14] Marilyn Pflederer, "How Children Conceptually Organize Musical Sound," (Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), Project No. 5-0256, ED 028 200, February, 1966-August, 1968.

> elements and that this information was needed for curriculum development. After studying fourth graders, they stated that although their instrument needed further refinement in order to make it more practical, it was, nevertheless, practical for research purposes. Specifically, they found that most children possess a more highly developed concept of loudness (and possibly of duration) than of pitch. It seemed, but was not conclusive, that some children confuse high-loud-fast and low-soft-slow. (Apparently this study was very enjoyable to the students because some of those not selected expressed disappointment.)[15]

A number of valuable studies have been conducted in the area of computer-assisted instruction, in programmed learning, in individualization within group instruction; many studies are concerned with learning and overlearning in music, with teen-age preferences and drop-out problems in music education. As important as they are, these subjects chosen for research are removed from the interest of this investigation.

Status studies can be found in a variety of shapes or designs. However, only two that were closely related to this research were located:

1. Lawrence H. McQuerrey studied the status of elementary

---

[15] Frances M. Andrews and Ned C. Diehl, "Development of a Technique for Identifying Elementary School Children's Musical Concepts," (Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), Project No. 5-0233, ED 016 517, July, 1965-September, 1967.

special music teachers in the California public schools in 1966 and came to the conclusion that the size of the school district appears to significantly affect the employment and use of special music teachers. Fewer districts with 16 to 30 elementary schools employ special music teachers and they provide the most unfavorable teacher-school ratios of any size category in the state. McQuerrey reported that 30% of California school districts employ neither special music teachers nor supervisors for their elementary music programs. "With no specialist help and no musical training required of classroom teachers, it would appear that many California school children are musically deprived."[16]

Although the McQuerrey investigation was not a national study, but was confined to the state of California, it nonetheless touched a concern of this investigation: the percentage of school districts in the nation that employ neither special music teachers nor supervisors in their elementary programs.

2. One other study touches a phase of this investigation: the research of Vincent J. Picerno in 1964 regarding the shortage of qualified music teachers in the state of New York. The investigation reported that not enough time is given to the teaching of music in the elementary schools of New York; that of the time spent, a greater part is taught by the music

---

[16] Lawrence H. McQuerrey, "The Status of Elementary Special Music Teachers in California Public Schools," Journal of Research in Music Education, Volume XVII, No. 4, Winter, 1969, p. 416.

> specialist and that very few classroom teachers take an active role in the teaching of music. Ninety percent of the music supervisors indicated that "the classroom teachers had either limited preparation or were unprepared to teach music."[17]

The studies cited above do not provide sufficient evidence of a broader, more comprehensive nature related to the status of elementary music education nationally, to the basic problems, or to the prevalent philosophies and goals of contemporary music programs in elementary education.

Thus, the present study is inclusive of a depth of inquiry and scope of concern which transcend any one specific categorical area yet reflect a good number of particular curricular aspects.

Educators in all areas of learning accept the facts that education must reflect changes in society and that subjects taught must adapt to the needs of the society in which they are taught; music education is no exception. In this regard, knowledge of present practices and problems is very important. Art subjects in an egalitarian society face dual complexities: developing the sensitivity of each child as an individual and developing general programs which can serve the total school population. Only investigation can reveal whether music educators on the elementary level have based their programs on a defensible philosophy of music education or have simply accepted or developed "outlines" of subject matter. Reading "about" music programs is not the same as hearing directly from the educators themselves.

---

[17] Vincent J. Picerno, "The Role of the Elementary Classroom Teacher and the Music Specialist: Opinions of the Music Supervisor," Journal of Research in Music Education, Volume XVIII, No. 2, Summer, 1970, p. 99.

Music's raison d'être within the school curriculum on the elementary level still seems to be primarily a cultural one, that is, to help "refine" the mind, the emotions, the manners, and the taste of children. The realization that one does not have to be a poet to enjoy poetry, a painter to love and enjoy great paintings, nor a composer to enjoy symphonies still seems very tangibly related to the existence of music in education at all. The noted educator James L. Mursell stated as early as 1943 that music is in the schools because "the American public, by and large, has come to want music for its children."[18] Allen P. Britton adds the teachers to this acknowledgement:

> Among the most remarkable aspects of American music education is the fact that it has stemmed entirely from the combined efforts of the teachers themselves and the general public. No government fiat placed music instruction in American schools or determined what forms it should take. Very few of our distinguished composers, performers, or critics have ever contributed to its development. American schoolmen in general have, on the whole, displayed a similar lack of interest, except when they have paused to wonder about this strange thing that grew up in their midst.[19]

In 1958, Lilla Belle Pitts developed a seven-point program that gave some purpose to elementary music:

> We must provide a balanced and interrelated program of music, beginning in the elementary school, which includes an integrated total of singing, expressive bodily movement, dramatic interpretation, playing instruments, discriminating listening,

---

[18] James L. Mursell, Music in American Schools, (New York: Silver Burdett Co., 1943), p. 11.

[19] Allen P. Britton, "Music Education: An American Specialty," Perspectives in Music Education: Source Book III, (Washington, D. C.: MENC, 1966), p. 19.

enabling skills, and creative activities.[20]

But neither this nor the reiteration of the Music Educators National Conference that the principal aim of instruction was love and appreciation of music brought us closer to the "why" of music education on the elementary level. Only in the last ten years or so have music educators begun to search for and discover other reasons why music education should exist on the elementary level, what some of its values are to growing boys and girls. Abraham A. Schwadron has put it this way:

> It is in the cultivation of attitudes, of psychological sets, of experience with the aesthetic act through interaction with aesthetic objects, that education makes its contribution. The fundamental task is not only to nurture the improvement of taste and discrimination, but also to develop the latent aesthetic reasons or criteria for such behavior. It is therefore in the belief that aesthetic stimulation is a necessary facet of life, that musical tastes can be developed and improved, and that all musical experiences can and should be aesthetically oriented, that the educational functions of music must be conceived.[21]

In his book Aesthetics: Dimensions for Music Education,[22] Schwadron further develops this theme and again points out the value of aesthetic inquiry in the development of philosophy and practice in music education. In an egalitarian society, it is imperative that the "why" of each subject's inclusion in the curriculum and the "how" as well are constantly reviewed. One question of interest to this investigation was: To what extent have elementary music educators utilized newer knowledge of aesthetic values? While this study can only touch the surface of needed research and exploration for the full answer to this question, it can at least be the beginning of such inquiry.

---

[20] Ibid., p. 21.

[21] Abraham A. Schwadron, "Aesthetic Values and Music Education," Music Educators Journal, May, 1964, p. 55.

[22] Abraham A. Schwadron, Aesthetics: Dimensions for Music Education, (Washington, D. C.: MENC, 1967).

Similarly, this study may not be able to delineate all the problems that exist in elementary music education, but it may be able to report the situation as expressed by a representative body of music educators across the nation. In order to advance the programs of early music education in the public schools and remove some of the handicaps and reasons for its present state of decline, it is exceedingly important to know what practicing music educators are doing and what they are thinking in music.

Further, such information is needed in order to analyze and compare properly various philosophies, methods, and practices as these relate to current thinking in educational psychology and philosophy. No really new or recent studies provide necessary information concerning music education in the very small districts of the United States; the most effusive and voluble reports have come from persons affiliated with the larger districts. The present inquiry hopes to fulfill that need. The educational challenges of the '70s demand improved music education programs for children; by understanding the present status of music education in both large and small districts recommendations for desirable, necessary, and practical revisions for the elementary music program would then emerge most judiciously.

The information gained from this survey and study might be very useful for any recommendations directed toward such change on a national level. It is possible that the information may clarify unnoticed differences that exist between:

1. the stated goals of the practicing music educator and the officially adopted goals of the Music Educators National Conference
2. the actual amount of time spent in classroom music (as reported by the music educators) and the minimum weekly time allotment recommended by the MENC
3. the financial needs of the elementary music programs as stated by the educators and the budget direction for MENC funds
4. the existence of trained music educators in the elementary schools of the United States and the recommendations of the profession as represented by the MENC

The information may also serve to point out the awareness of practicing music educators to: (1) contemporary trends in educational philosophy and psychology; (2) new directions in the fields of aesthetics and musicality; and (3) new knowledge related to learning and the development of skills in elementary music education.

Scope of the Study

This study will concern itself only with elementary music education as taught in 1972 in the public schools of the United States from pre-kindergarten and kindergarten through the sixth grade. It will attempt to give a clear and true picture of practices and problems in a four-fold manner: (1) as expressed by the music educators themselves; (2) as seen in personal observations of music in elementary classrooms and in instrumental training classes; (3) as reflected in articles published in the field (1970-72); and (4) as expressed by elementary administrators in personal interviews.

This investigation is not meant to develop a new course of study nor to recommend an old one. It will, however, consider recent innovative programs and emerging ideas for change as developed and expressed by practicing music educators. Finally, it will synthesize information of present practices and problems so that the information may be used to make recommendations for further study that may lay the foundation for improved music education in the elementary schools.

The plan for this survey evolved as a result of personal study at the source of several well-known innovative programs: (1) in Austria, the Carl Orff and the Anna Lechner programs; (2) in Hungary, the Zoltán Kodály program; (3) in Holland, the Anton Van Prooijen program; and (4) in Japan, the Yokohama, Obara, and Suzuki programs.

The plan for this survey was developed after critical study of music education guides, frameworks, and programs in elementary schools; of music texts in elementary schools (for both students and teachers) and their related recordings; of studies of professional journals in music education and related fields. The data were collected by the use of a questionnaire sent in January, 1972, to 2,009 school districts across the United States and from personal interviews with 27 elementary school administrators representing western, north central, north eastern, and southern areas of the country.

Summary

This study was directed toward an investigation and analysis of the status and the problems of elementary music education in the United States in 1972 as reflected in: (1) the opinions and attitudes of practicing music educators in representative districts throughout the nation; (2) the literature and publications of music educators; and (3) the opinions of elementary school administrators.

The information gathered for this study included:

1. a random sampling of elementary districts in the United States by means of a questionnaire
2. observations of elementary classroom music and instrumental training as taught in large and small districts
3. a study of interests and trends in elementary music education as evidenced in professional publications
4. personal interviews with elementary administrators

The information was sought from practicing teachers as well as from others responsible for the elementary music programs in 1972; the data gained from the questionnaire were subjected to statistical analysis by David Kimble, a graduate student in computer science at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, California.

The report itself is organized to present: (1) the problem being investigated; (2) the trends, philosophies, and prevailing attitudes in the practice of elementary music education; (3) the literature in other fields related to music education as well as in elementary music education itself; (4) the investigation; and (5) conclusions and recommendations as a result of this study.

CHAPTER II

ELEMENTARY MUSIC EDUCATION, 1950-1972

Music education on the elementary level is in need of careful research and ongoing study. The goal of extending to every child the opportunity for individual growth and development in music cannot be achieved without attention to: (1) early childhood education and (2) foundations for developing musical sensitivity and musical understanding. The development of each child's potential in music is, to a great extent, dependent upon early musical experiences. Present practices and programs must be examined in the light of trends and philosophies that have developed in elementary music education during the last twenty or more years if constructive recommendations for needed reforms in elementary music programs are to be offered.

As stated earlier, elementary music education is only a very dependent, small part of the elementary curriculum, a mere spoke in the Gestaltian wheel of elementary education. Behind the elementary music education program differences exist in points of view, basic purposes, attitudes: in short, in philosophies. These may dominate the music program. Some of these varying philosophies in the elementary schools reflect generally the concern of administrators for the public and its attitudes, for trends in educational stresses, and for problems with budgets; the philosophy of the elementary music program in terms of its purposes and goals can be seen as a part of these same concerns.

In order to clarify the basis for the existence of these varying philosophies in the elementary school and in its music program, certain facts are worthy of consideration:

1. As of 1973, the nation has over 33,000,000 elementary school children enrolled in grades one through eight (exclusive of kindergarten).
2. There is no statutory or mandated curriculum emanating from the federal government and its Office of Education for these children.
3. Even minimal standards which may be required by legislation are tied to certain fiscal appropriations.

By law and by action it is the state, for the most part, that legislates requirements, and trends in the states show a relaxing of specific requirements and the substitution of more general ones. Such decentralization of educational controls is characteristic of a democratic society. State superintendents are asked to give leadership and direction and to make recommendations, but only the local boards can set policy. Furthermore, elementary classroom teachers, although they may be asked to teach music, are rarely required to qualify in music as a condition of employment (as they are in many European countries). A few units in music education may be required for state certification, but these courses only serve as an introduction to music. The great variety in music education programs found on the elementary level may be traced in part to differences in state certification requirements; to differences in state educational organization, structure, and planning; as well as to differences in administrative philosophy and policy on both state and local levels. It is also interesting to note that in 1970 the MENC listed only 35 of the 50 states as having state music supervisors and, as a matter of fact, California, the most populous state, had none. It follows that although the Music Educators National Conference of over 61,000 members and other similar organizations may frequently meet on many levels and areas of music education to confer, debate, and pass resolutions, inevitably the control lies in the hands of the recommending local administrators and their policy-making boards.

Concern for the above is frequently evidenced in articles appearing in music and other publications as well as in the official voice of the Music Educators National Conference, the Music Educators Journal:

1. Music Educators Journal:

   January, 1970: A section devoted to school administrators, pp. 52-63.

   January, 1972: A section devoted to the Public Relations Committee's two-year study and extensive report: "Building Community Support for the Music Program," pp. 25-56.

2. Nations Schools:

   April, 1970: Don E. Minaglia's regular section devoted to curriculum planning: "Updating Music Studies," p. 44.

3. Music Journal:

   March, 1972: Alfred Balkin, "Educators Must Face Reality," p. 35.

Concern for these factors has frequently been expressed by educators. Over a decade ago eminent educator Harry S. Broudy observed:

> The place music may achieve in a specific curriculum often depends more on the relations of music to other areas of value and life than of aesthetic consideration.[23]

The Trends

Over two decades have passed since the American Association of School Administrators stated that children have certain inalienable rights, and that the curriculum for the elementary school must take into account these rights of childhood. The Council of Past Presidents of the Music Educators National Conference immediately prepared a resolution that implemented this point of view. "The Child's Bill of Rights" was adopted by the 1950 MENC Biennial Convention and was widely distributed in this country and abroad. The banner "music for every child; every child for music" was flown far and wide.

Eight years later, in 1958, this same august body, the American Association of School Administrators, passed another art-supporting resolution that was greeted with national endorsement by professional music educators. The resolution said, in part:

> We believe in a well-balanced school curriculum in which music, drama, painting, poetry, sculpture, architecture, and the like are included side by side with other important subjects such as mathematics, history, and science. It is important that pupils, as part of general education, criticize with discrimination those products of the mind, the voice, the hand and the body which give dignity to the person and exalt the spirit of man.

---

[23] Harry S. Broudy, "A Realistic Philosophy of Music Education," in Nelson B. Henry, Ed., Basic Concepts in Music Education, The Fifty-Seventh Yearbook of the National Society of Education, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), p. 69.

Although the reception for these words was unanimously enthusiastic, music educators were apparently not conscious of their lack of critical understanding of the problems involved or the need for implementation; nor were they conscious of the disagreement among themselves regarding the musical interpretation of the resolution. To some music educators, the resolution implied that now all children were to have a well-balanced curriculum, and the job was only to see to it that all children had opportunities for development in music. The teaching of music was now to be geared to the masses: the development of a "love" for music, the experiencing of the pleasures of music must be given priority over the sheer development of skills in music. These were music educators who held that in an age of science which emphasizes the material aspects of living, there is a great need for those leavening qualities of music embodied in its aesthetic and spiritual properties; its emphasis on the enrichment of life; its use as a means for forming a critical basis for value judgments; its use in stimulating opportunities for creative development; its potential as a study area to help develop an understanding for people of other times and places; its aesthetic values; its therapeutic values; etc.

To other music educators, these same words of the same resolution meant that since music was as important a subject as science or mathematics, then it, too, must be taught as an academic discipline with priority given to the structure of learning in music and the development of skills in music. These were music educators who believed that music must be accepted as a major area of study and must be allotted an amount of study time equal to that of other academic disciplines. For the latter, the development of an "appreciation" in music meant the development of understanding of music through knowledge and skill in music.

A definite dichotomy in thinking began to pervade elementary music education. Some saw music as a means toward desirable educational goals; others saw it as an end in itself. There was disagreement on the subject of goals, aims, methods, and even materials. The late '50s and early '60s saw a rash of publications and evaluations, much research, and many recommendations.

The fifth-seventh yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education was devoted entirely to music education; this erudite publication, entitled Basic Concepts in Music Education, appeared in 1958. It was the result of deep concern for standards of music teaching as well as teacher preparation, concern for a balanced program, and concern for a realistic relationship between music education and national culture. It emphasized the "emerging trends toward more effective orientation of instructional programs to accepted goals of formal education."[24]

Among distinguished educators and philosophers in music education, James L. Mursell of Teachers College, Columbia University, stated the purpose of all music teaching from the developmental point of view: to bring about the evolution of musical responsiveness or musicality. Foster MacMurray of the University of Illinois presented a pragmatic point of view in defining the aim of music education; it was:

---

[24] Nelson B. Henry, in Basic Concepts in Music Education, op. cit., p. viii.

> to help everyone to further awareness of patterns of sound as an aesthetic component in the world of experience; to increase each person's capacity to control the availability of aesthetic richness through music; and to transform the public musical culture into a recognized part of each person's environment.[25]

Harry S. Broudy, also of the University of Illinois, presented the realist's position:

> To say that music ought to be a part of general education is to say that all of us ought to be musically literate, that is, able to express ourselves in musical terms and to understand these terms when used by somebody else. These might be called the skills of expression and impression. These skills would include the skills of listening, reading, composing, etc., as well as of musical performance.[26]

The key concept that Broudy employed was that of connoisseurship. Growth of taste and appreciation was held to be correlative with growth in musical skill, knowledge, and the ability to comprehend and discriminate musical qualities. For Broudy, music education was an end in itself; for MacMurray, music education was a partial means of achieving a broader goal of general education.

Where this book did make its most important contribution to music education was in the clarification of relationships between teaching music and other subjects, and in understanding the child, contemporary philosophies, and psychologies of education. Here also was clarification of the need for future conceptual frameworks for music education. But in the area of elementary music education (and probably secondary as well) it has little impact. The elementary principals were still trying to justify time on the regular school schedule for music, and the general classroom teachers were still struggling with a subject area in which their legitimate fears were based on inadequate preparation. Neither could cope with "concepts of concepts" in music. Actually, the book was addressed to "students in training for careers in the field of music and to music teachers in service." On the elementary level most of the music teachers in service were classroom teachers; this book, therefore, while stressing better musicians, better scholars, and better teachers, did not offer solutions to the problems of music in the elementary school.

---

[25] Foster MacMurray, in Basic Concepts in Music Education, op. cit., p. 4.

[26] Harry S. Broudy, op. cit., p. 77.

In 1959, the magazine National Elementary Principal devoted its entire December issue to the elementary music program: "Why Music Education?" was followed by "Classroom Teachers Can Teach Music!" The argument here was that music was not a "special" subject and "if music is to become a truly integrated part of the total educational program, affecting the lives of children and adults then the teaching cannot be limited to the minority known as music specialists. Music is for all. Let us all work together."[27]

Concern for the state of music teaching, especially for that subject titled "general music" was expressed by the MENC in 1959; this led to recommendations and a five-year study.[28] Since general music is taught in both the elementary and the junior high years, it was of special interest to elementary districts that include grades from one through eight. The concept of "music appreciation" as music understanding began to develop, and many general music classes were now retitled "music understanding."

---

[27] Lula Kilpatrick, "Classroom Teachers Can Teach Music!", National Elementary Principal, December, 1959, p. 11.

[28] Karl D. Ernst, Music in General Education, (Washington, D. C.: MENC, 1965).

Opinion and comment on teaching music in the elementary school was also reported by Hartsell for the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development in 1963.[29] In this publication no attempt was made to answer any one question exhaustively nor to explore any special phase of music teaching; rather, it suggested ideas and recommended practices that might be helpful in providing music instruction in grades one through six. Its basic tenets were:

1. Even if there is a special music teacher assigned to the classroom, the instruction in music should be a shared responsibility.
2. It is a major fallacy to assume that classroom instruction in elementary music taught by a music specialist will be superior to the classroom music taught by the classroom teacher.
3. A desirable plan for music instruction would provide a music teacher for each elementary school.

(Hartsell pointed out that the study made in 1962 by the Research Division of the National Education Association showed that of all elementary music instructors, 40% were classroom teachers who had assistance from music specialists, fewer were classroom teachers who had no assistance, and only 20% were music specialists.)[30] Music activities discussed were singing, responding to music through movements, listening, and playing instruments. Music reading came in for only brief discussion; why, when, and how music reading was to be taught was not developed. A few teacher preferences for music reading method were stated, but no research on methods for teaching music reading was cited.

---

[29] O. M. Hartsell, Teaching Music in the Elementary School, (Washington, D. C.: ASCD, 1963).

In the '60s several other very important developments in the field of music education took place; these should have influenced the entire trend of music education. That they did not may be attributed to lack of nationwide distribution and provisions for implementation and adoption.

The first of these, the 1963 Yale Seminar on Music Education, while adding nothing new but instead reinforcing ideas that had already been expressed by music educators, was, nonetheless, very important for several reasons:

1. It brought together and involved in music education for the first time distinguished professionals in music not normally concerned with the problems of music education. (The main justification for the seminar was stated as the potential eradication of the lack of communication between the realm of music education and professional activity.)
2. It represented a research development activity in the arts that was funded by federal monies. The federal Office of Education utilized funds allowable under Public Law 531's Cooperative Research Program, which was established in 1954.

---

[30] Ibid, p. 7.

A full report of the seminar was published by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Office of Education.[31]

With regard to communication between the educators in music and the professionals in music, Allen P. Britton has stated that very few of our distinguished composers, performers, or critics have made firm contributions to the development of music education in the United States.[32] Until 1959, when a Ford Foundation program began to place young composers in residence with school systems, the machinery and lines of communication were lacking for the exploration of the immense resources that the present school of native composers represents.

The twelve-day Yale Seminar on Music Education stated that the primary aim of music education was the development of musicality, and that "a basic musicality should be developed before the teaching of reading, notation, composing, or analysis is attempted, for these skills become mechanical and meaningless without it."[33] The seminar recommended new materials as well as new ways of teaching and unequivocally stated:

> Trained musicians are needed to carry out these curricular goals. Ultimately, only teachers trained in music should be teaching music in the schools, although it is acknowledged that the recommendation is not immediately feasible. The burden of music teaching in the

---

[31] Claude V. Palisca, Music in Our Schools, A Search for Improvement: Report of the Yale Seminar on Music Education, (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office Bulletin No. 28, OE-33033, 1964), p. 8.

[32] Allen P. Britton, "Music Education: An American Specialty," Perspectives in Music Education: Source Book III, (Washington, D. C.: MENC, 1966), p. 19.

[33] Claude V. Palisca, op. cit., p. 6.

> elementary schools now falls on the classroom teacher, who needs retraining to fulfill this role.[34]

The seminar strongly criticized the repertory used in most school systems in the United States and called it ill-chosen, of appalling quality, restricted in scope, corrupted by arrangements, not properly coordinated with the development of theoretical and historical insights, and neglectful of children's creative ability. It analyzed and reported recommendations in other areas of music education such as guided listening, performance activities, maintenance of musical interest (in advanced as well as beginning students), musicians in residence, and the use of musical community resources as well as national resources. Most of all it stressed qualified music teachers, better teacher training, and planned teacher retraining. The seminar gave some thought and discussion to the implementation of its recommendations and suggested that a pilot program followed by proper evaluation be set up in detail in a number of schools.

Direct outgrowth of the federally-funded Yale Seminar were the Juilliard Study, designed to broaden children's musical repertoire (published later as the Juilliard Repertory), the Educational Media Conference, designed to provide an introduction to the techniques of operant conditioning which forms the psychological background for programmed learning, and the Yale Music Curriculum itself.

The second important development of the '60s was the enactment by the 89th Congress of the United States of three new and sweeping laws:

---

[34] Ibid, p. 10.

(1) The Elementary and Secondary Act, Public Law 89-10, approved April 11, 1965; (2) The National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act, Public Law 89-209, approved September 29, 1965; and (3) The Higher Education Act, Public Law 89-329, approved November 8, 1965. For music education, all three of these acts were of great significance; all five of the specific titles under the first act (rapidly shortened by the profession to ESEA) were of inestimable value to elementary music education. Federal funds initially were made available to the school districts themselves. Under Title III of ESEA, for example, appropriations for PACE (Projects to Advance Creativity in Education, subtitled Pacesetters in Innovation) amounted to $75 million in 1965, $187 million in 1967, and $165 million in 1969. The purpose of PACE, as stated in the Office of Education manual for prospective project applicants was to:

1. encourage the development of innovations
2. demonstrate worthwhile innovations in educational practice through exemplary programs
3. supplement existing facilities

Across the nation, music educators responded to this encouragement to develop innovative projects.

Britton aptly put it earlier (1958):

> Many American music educators have demonstrated what may be considered an easy readiness to climb aboard any intellectual bandwagon which happened to be nearby, and to trust it to arrive at destinations appropriate for music educators, or worse, to adopt its destination as their own without careful enough scrutiny

of the intellectual properties involved.[35]

In music, 92 projects were reported approved in 36 states. Here was Jean Piaget (Evanston, Illinois, OE No. 5-0256); there was Carl Orff (Bellflower, California, OE No. 66-257 and Monmouth, Oregon, OE No. 5-8263); here was Zoltán Kodály (Columbia, South Carolina, OE No. 67-4445 and Urbana, Illinois, OE No. 9-0352); and there was a combination study of Orff and Kodály (Madera, California, OE No. 66-1418). A Suzuki project was carried on in Urbana, Illinois (OE No. 5-8444); and a Suzuki-Kendal study was done in El Monte, California (OE No. 67-1544-1); music education through television was studied in Dallas, Texas (OE No. 67-4358) and in Greenville, North Carolina (OE No. 5-8306). The Manhattanville Music Curriculum Project was headquartered at Purchase, New York (OE No. 6-1999). These new programs and ideas caught the imagination of music educators across the land. One project abstract devoted to a study of musicality in elementary children opened with this sentence:

> "Guiding the Development of Musicality in Elementary School Children" is proposed to be accomplished through innovational instructional approaches utilizing multi-sensory channels toward discovery of the conceptual structure of music through the natural and elemental avenues of speech, drama, movement, rhythmics, singing, instrumental playing and symbolization with emphasis on discovery and improvisatory activities, augmented by personality-involved contacts with visiting artist-musician specialist performances personnel from which will evolve new and authentic elements of musicality and aesthetic sensitivity to incorporate

---

[35] Allen P. Britton, "Music in Early American Public Education: A Historical Critique," Basic Concepts in Music Education, op. cit., p. 207.

into the instructional design.[36]

A January, 1969, report in the Music Educators Journal ("Where Has All the Money Gone?"), listed forty-six of the music projects under these three principal categories: (1) cultural enrichment programs (there were twenty-seven--mostly concerts for youth); (2) instrumental training (there were seven--mostly string projects, musically talented, etc.); and (3) innovative instructional methods (there were twelve--Suzuki, Orff, Kodály, etc.).[37] Thirty of the projects were at that time listed as being continuously refunded and still in progress; sixteen of the projects were reported as terminated at that time. In November, 1969 (after funds had been cut off for more than a year), an Office of Education researcher reported that eighty-five percent of the three hundred thirty innovative programs (all fields) funded for three years from Title III of the ESEA had survived and were still operating. He stated that the survival rate exceeded the "most optimistic expectations" of the program's creators.[38] (This researcher did not find the same survival rate for elementary music projects and reported the fact to the author of the report. A reply was received from the Office of Education to the effect that music and art subjects did suffer greater losses. A much lower survival rate was acknowledged in these areas.)

---

[36] Title III, ESEA, Progress Report: Guiding the Development of Musicality in Elementary School Children; Phase I: May-June, 1966, Madera County, California.

[37] Title III, ESEA Projects in Music: "Where Has All the Money Gone?", Music Educators Journal, January, 1969, Volume 55, No. 5, pp. 66-72.

[38] Norman E. Hearn, " ... After Fund Cut-Offs," Nations Schools, November, 1969, p. 30.

The third very important development came in 1967 when the MENC launched the most ambitious and comprehensive conference of its entire 60 years of existence. What made the Tanglewood Symposium unique was that it focused on the world outside that of music education and brought together distinguished thinkers from many fields other than music education. The nation was deeply shocked by continuous incidents of protest and confrontation and by worsening problems of the inner city. MENC President Wersen put it simply:

> In an era of protest, irritation, and rapid change, when students tell us that the music we teach and the methods that we use are irrelevant and ineffectual, music educators cannot simply sit back with eyes closed and ears tuned backward.[39]

Riots in Detroit and Newark headlined the daily papers as musicians, sociologists, labor leaders, foundation representatives, communication leaders, and educators sat down together to confer on the critical issues previously identified by consultants and 800 musicians, educators, etc. at Division Conference during the previous intensive year of preparation.[40] Participants felt the urgency and the importance of what they were doing: in the world of change, they were trying to consider the future; in the state of confusion and turmoil, they were coming to grips with the problem of strengthening music in the American society.

---

[39] Louis G. Wersen, Tanglewood address partially quoted in Music Educators Journal, February, 1968, p. 42; also quoted in Judith Murphy and George Sullivan, Music in American Society, An Interpretive Report, (Washington, D. C.: MENC, 1968).

[40] Robert A. Choate and Max Kaplan, "Music in American Society: An Introduction to Issues," Music Educators Journal, April, 1967, p. 43.

At Tanglewood, it was stated that the basic purpose of the symposium was to reappraise and reevaluate assumptions and beliefs about music education; to arouse concern about musical activities in the entire culture; and to explore the possible ways and means of the programs becoming more effective in music education. New dimensions for the profession of music education were sought. There were, of course, differing concerns represented at the symposium: for some, the most important job that music education should do was to develop audiences; for others, the concern was the problems of youth; for still others, the concern was a comprehensive design that might cover all needs. There was, nonetheless, definite agreement on many points, among them:

1. Music serves best when its integrity as an art is maintained.
2. Music of all periods, styles, forms, and cultures belongs in the curriculum.
3. Schools should provide adequate time for music programs ranging from pre-school through adult or continuing education.
4. Greater emphasis should be placed on the individual student to fulfill his needs, goals, and potential.
5. The music education profession must contribute its skills, proficiencies, and insights toward assisting in the solution of urgent problems of the inner city.
6. Developments in educational technology, educational television, programmed instruction, and computer-assisted instruction should be applied to music study and research.

Generally, the symposium made the following recommendations with regard to music in early childhood:

1. Children should have some type of formal schooling at about three in order to offset inadequate musical exposure at home.
2. The serious lack of trained music teachers should be corrected.
3. Young children's musical experiences should be integrated.
4. The concept of the self-contained classroom may be considered best under a concept of the self-contained school.
5. There is a need to coordinate efforts in music education with the related efforts of educators in early childhood education.

But as Schwadron aptly pointed out:

> Little in the summarized recommendations is genuinely new or surprising.... What is new is that the MENC is not only promulgating desirable change but also actively supporting its fulfillment. Such backing is of utmost importance for satisfactory outcomes.[41]

The results of the Tanglewood Symposium might be reported succinctly in the declaration that the conference developed:

> We believe that education must now concern itself with the art of living, with building personal identity, and with creativity. Since the study of music can contribute so much to these ends, we now call for music to be placed in the core of the curriculum.[42]

The MENC took the message directly to its board of directors, to its state presidents, and to all the state supervisors; the Music Educators Journal (November, 1967) carried the message to its (then) 60,000 readers. Filmstrips and tapes were offered at nominal cost in an attempt to deliver a "you were there" experience to viewers. In March of 1968, the national MENC convention at Seattle, Washington, devoted a large portion of its agenda to the Tanglewood Symposium. Many committees and subcommittees developed in local, state, and national areas of organization in music education. And now, a veritable shibboleth of educational jargon was released in the form of position papers and "we believe" statements.

---

[41] Abraham A. Schwadron, "The Tanglewood Symposium Summons," Music Journal, September, 1968, p. 40.

[42] Judith Murphy and George Sullivan, Music in American Society, An Interpretive Report, (Washington, D. C.: MENC, 1968).

In California, the CMEA of the MENC released a "position paper in music education" (December, 1968), based on the Tanglewood Symposium and the state's newly enacted George E. Miller Act of 1968. The position paper was mailed to approximately 16,000 persons related to education in California: to administrators in education; to legislators; to private, parochial, and public school boards; to officials of the state board of education and all members of the state education commissions as well as to music educators and members of the CMEA. Judd Chew, then president of the CMEA, made a special request of the membership in an accompanying letter: "Will you consider assisting in the following ways?" Other state music educators associations did the same. While it cannot be stated that rapid changes followed these actions (especially on the elementary level), it can be stated that on the part of the leaders in music education, there was development of constructive ideas to fulfill the needs pointed out by the Tanglewood Symposium. The focal points were now:

1. the need for the MENC to take an official position supporting a well-trained music specialist for each elementary school
2. the need for new curriculum in the teacher training institutions in order to meet the demands of specialized tasks in music education

3. the need for greater understanding of the individual child and the role in the child's growth and development
4. the need for greater understanding of musical aesthetics and philosophy in music education, etc.

It is interesting to note what happened to point one: the first and foremost administrative act of MENC President Wiley L. Housewright in September of 1968 was the appointment of a seven-member commission on teacher education. This commission was charged with the critical tasks of:

1. identifying pressing needs in the pre-service and in-service education of music teachers and determining priorities
2. developing precise recommendations for the preparation of music educators in cooperation with the MENC's Contemporary Music Project, the National Association of Schools of Music, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and other involved organizations
3. identifying innovative and exemplary programs in teacher education that may serve as models for change
4. proposing necessary revisions in advanced programs in music education
5. suggesting ways in which in-service programs can best move present members of the profession to involve themselves in the expanding role of music education called for in the

Tanglewood Declaration[43]

At its earliest meetings, the commission established its list of 13 objectives and set up various task groups to study the objectives and make recommendations:

Task Group I:	Qualities and Competencies for Music Educators
Task Group II:	Recommendations for Critically Needed Changes in Teacher Education
Task Group III:	Identification of Innovative Programs and Practices in the Pre-Service Preparation of Music Educators
Task Group IV:	Musical Qualities and Competencies for the Classroom Teachers

In October of 1970 the MENC Commission on Teacher Education in Music made its interim report. Following the commission's recommendation that "music in the classroom should be taught by music specialists," was its statement that it recognized, however, that "this may not be feasible for every school at present. Therefore each person planning to teach in the elementary school should receive sufficient preparation to handle such instruction."[44] Task Group IV was challenged with the responsibility of developing statements of musical competencies and qualities for elementary classroom teachers. Furthermore, Task Group IV had been firmly instructed:

> At the present time the Commission position and the official MENC position on the utilization of music specialists should not be

---

[43] Wiley L. Housewright, "Charge to the Commission," Music Educators Journal, October, 1970, p. 35.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

> confused. The MENC has no firmly stated position at present on the preference for music specialists rather than elementary classroom generalists with special music training in the elementary music education program. The preparation of the competencies statement requested by the National Assembly should not be misconstrued as an official MENC position; clarification on this matter will be forthcoming from the National Executive Board in the near future.[45]

In May, 1971, Task Group IV made its initial report with an introduction that repeated the commission's recommendation and qualifying statements. Task Group IV had come to the conclusion that all classroom teachers must be able to:

1. make music (melodic, harmonic, and rhythmic; vocal and some instrumental)
2. conduct music (knowledge of pulse, attack, release, dynamics, etc.)
3. guide the creative experiences of children in music (improvisation, movement)
4. utilize simple procedures used in composing music
5. utilize various kinds of notations when appropriate (translating sound into symbol)
6. perceive aurally the basic sound-events of music (single tone to combinations)
7. respond physically to promote musical understanding (movement, dancing)
8. be receptive to music (awareness of styles, periods, cultures, etc.)
9. guide students in musical experiences (developing musicality)

---

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

10. utilize a wide range of educational resources in developing musical awareness[46]

Although the goals of the MENC were clearly spelled out and the president at that time, Frances M. Andrews, had written "Music Education: Responsibility for Change, Accountability for Progress,"[47] all effort in 1971 seemed to be directed to higher education and new courses for teacher training. Neglected areas of concern were: (1) a philosophy of music education for the elementary schools; (2) the climate necessary for elementary music education; and (3) the acceptance (on the part of elementary administrators) of qualifications necessary for teaching music on the elementary level. Finally, after years of emphasis on the part of many music educators that music on the elementary level must be taught by music specialists, MENC's national executive board, in July of 1972, adopted an official MENC position based on a paper prepared by the National Commission on Instruction.

> The nature of music, the importance of arts experiences for all children, the significance of aesthetic education in the life of the individual, and the variety of musical objectives that emanate from these concerns indicate that satisfactory instructional leadership can best be defined as a skilled teacher whose preparation includes substantial work in music leading to those competencies that have been suggested by the MENC Commission on Teacher Education. This would include the person who has a music education degree as well as one who may have a strong minor or second major in music.[48]

---

[46] MENC Commission on Teacher Education, Task Group IV Initial Report: "Musical Competencies for Classroom Teachers," Music Educators Journal, May, 1971, p. 40.

[47] Frances M. Andrews, "Responsibility for Change, Accountability for Progress," Music Educators Journal, May, 1971, p. 26.

[48] "The Music Specialist in the Elementary School," a position paper prepared by the MENC National Commission on Instruction, Music Educators Journal, November, 1972, p. 60.

Acknowledging general elementary music as a crucial area of concern, the commission went a step further than advancing its position: it called attention to "certain qualities of an adequate music program at the elementary school level." These, they said, must include:

1. Appropriate pupil-teacher ratios.
2. Adequate music instruction ... extended over the entire academic year. The equivalent of at least three half-hour periods per week would seem minimal.
3. Teachers and pupils must have access to a wide variety of essential instructional materials and specialized equipment, as well as specialized spaces designed to facilitate musical learning, at all stages of learning.
4. Music programs must be permitted to adapt to newer learning environments and instructional situations emerging as a consequence of recent attention given to ... [new ideas in pupil grouping, staffing, scheduling, physical facilities, etc.][49]

By January of 1973, Up Beat, a newsletter published by the MENC, reported an interview with President Jack E. Schaeffer on the position finally taken officially. The question was asked if it was not unrealistic to push for elementary music specialists "when we are in an economic squeeze and there may not be enough qualified people anyway." President Schaeffer conceded that a new NEA research report had shown a decided shortage of graduating elementary music specialists in 1971-72, but stressed that a strong elementary music program was essential to good music programs at upper levels and that support would come from many sources, mostly from the music educator himself. "It's up to the members to broadcast the message to parents, administrators, school boards, and others."[50]

---

[49] Loc. cit., p. 61.

It does not seem, at this time, that there is a concerted effort on the part of the MENC to activate these vital recommendations. Plans announced for conferences in March, 1973, included the following: (1) the western division conferences are emphasizing self-renewal and musicianly functions; (2) the northwest convention is interested in "the many faces of music" interrelated and cross-fertilized to cut across musical disciplines;[51] (3) the southwestern division is concentrating on "innovation and pluralism" in music education; and (4) the north central division is organizing its conference both on levels of music education and on music subjects such as ethnic music, nongraded open classroom, "confrontation and crisis," etc. Viewing the announced conferences as a whole, they seem to be repeating past patterns: much musical performance on the part of professionals and students and the usual lecture and discussion topics (accountability, technology, individualization, open classroom, ethnic music, world cultures, learning in music, etc.). There does not seem to be an organized effort of music educators directed toward the heart of the particular problem: elementary music education, taught as a core subject by trained music teachers.

---

[50] Interview with President Jack E. Schaeffer, Up Beat, January, 1973, Vol. 1, No. 2.

[51] Ibid., p. 4.

Prevailing Attitudes

As the wheels of general elementary music education have moved full circle from "correlate" through "innovate" and now back to "relevance," elementary music education has followed in the lockstep of whatever thinking prevailed. That there is any change from the 1962 picture of elementary music instruction as reported by the NEA (only 20% taught by music specialists)[52] is questionable, yet of genuine interest to this investigation. However, even if elementary music education were under complete control of specialists trained in music, it would most likely move simultaneously in several different, but not necessarily mutually exclusive directions. While there seems to be an undercurrent of conflict between differing attitudes regarding music education in America, this is not sensed at the conferences sponsored by the MENC or its affiliated organizations. With much overlapping of minor detail, one can, however, easily detect very different stresses and certainly differing points of view. Of course, these cannot be called philosophies in the true sense of the word for they do not represent systematic statements about the value or the nature of music education; what they do represent are points of view upon which many elementary music education programs seem to be built. A few of the typical attitudes expressed by elementary administrators and teachers of elementary music (some general classroom teachers, some music specialists) in 1972 discussions were:

---

[52] O. M. Hartsell, op. cit., p. 7.

1. On the elementary level, music should exist only for the enjoyment and pleasure of all the children. It should be planned for their relaxation, their release of tension, and their leisure time. It should utilize whatever method is found enjoyable and should begin with familiar music. It can be taught just as well by the classroom teacher who knows the children as by the music specialist who knows the music.
2. Music should exist in the elementary schools in order to help transmit the culture and the heritage of the nation. It should be closely correlated with American history. It should carry an indigenous approach using whatever methods are most suitable and tell the story of music from earliest America to the electronic age.
3. General elementary music should represent the base of the pyramid of music education, while secondary music education should concentrate on the development of music skills in the talented few. The musical needs of the elementary masses can be fulfilled by "sings" and similar music activity; therefore, concentration, if any, should be only on the identification of the musically gifted. The music of the future will be produced by the very few and heard by the very many.
4. Music is vital to progress in all civilizations. Elementary music education should concentrate on musical literacy and give every child the opportunity to develop ability, knowledge, and skills in music. It should be presented in an organized,

orderly manner as an academic subject, taught only by music specialists.

There are many variations on the above themes. The visits of Joan Gaines, MENC's director of public relations, to eight communities to interview opinion leaders revealed many of these. Following are a few statements made by school superintendents:

> I evaluate music education in terms of quality of performance and musical opportunities for as many students as possible.
>
> I measure the success of the music program in terms of audience responses and in terms of the carry-over reflected by church choirs in the community.
>
> My objectives for music education are providing opportunities for the kids who have talent so that they can go further with music, and making kids aware of what music is--what it has to offer--so that they will become discriminating consumers.
>
> My number one goal for music education is "the love to sing." We must not kill enthusiasm.
>
> There are not enough teachers who can communicate with the "other eighty percent" so that kids get real enjoyment out of music.... Let's make some type of music available to the "other eighty percent" on a basis where they will enjoy it. I want students who will say, "Oh boy! Music!"
>
> To me, music is an essential part of life and especially of American life. It is a medium of communication for expression and feeling.
>
> I have no personal involvement with music and am really more interested in sports. However, music is an important dimension of experience for all kids.
>
> A new data processing system will put a price tag on music in the school system starting in 1972.[53]

The variety of stresses and attitudes expressed by music educators and by superintendents again reflects possible ambiguity in the direction in which music education is going. Music educators are beginning to express themselves concerning the "image" they think they might project to the principal, and the "picture" they themselves frequently have of superintendents.[54] The surreptitious complaint of the specialists in in music about the lip service and hypocrisy of their superintendents has, at last, appeared in print.[55] The shock of this unveiling is matched only by the egocentric interests of superintendents: of self-image and of influence. According to a report of a survey by the editors of Nations Schools:

---

[53] Joan Gaines, "What Do Community Leaders Say?", Music Educators Journal, January, 1970, p. 53 ff.

> The profile of a school superintendent that emerges from a recent Nations Schools survey is not that of a man having an identity crisis. The typical superintendent regards himself as the chief educational leader of his small community.... Some administrators define their roles rather grandly: ... leader-organizer-delegator-dreamer; manager of the biggest business in town.... From North Carolina comes the tongue-in-cheek response: "the number one school man with all the answers."[56]

Rating their performance as: (1) excellent; (2) good; (3) fair; or (4) poor; 81% picked the first two categories.[57]

Such variety of attitudes and lack of any well-defined direction on the part of music educators and elementary administrators could explain, at least in part, the lack of any critical change in elementary music education during the past twenty years. It is not surprising that the extensive work of Bruner, Piaget, Orff, Kodály, Suzuki, and others has not inspired dramatic innovation in the total elementary music program or caused educators to recognize the need for clarification of direction and pursuit of goals. It cannot be denied, however, that such educational studies as related to music have provided necessary inspiration and groundwork for a large number of research projects, for extensive exploration, and for a number of highly successful innovative pilot programs. The contribution of a number of these to elementary music education deserves attention.

---

[54] Ibid., p. 42.

[55] "Lip Service Is Disservice Without Action" (editorial), Music Educators Journal, January, 1970, p. 53 ff.

[56] "How Superintendents See Themselves," Russell J. Huff, ed., Nations Schools, November, 1969, p. 35 ff.

[57] Ibid., p. 36.

Innovative Programs in Elementary Music Education

The following brief summary of contemporary innovative programs reflects the influences of programs from abroad as well as programs developed in America. Some of these were originally federally funded; some, financed by corporations; and some, by the MENC. Their impact on current elementary school music education is of prime consideration here.

The Program of Carl Orff

Carl Orff, one of the few internationally known composers to contribute to the field of music education, began his program in Munich, Germany, nearly 50 years ago. It was then and, to a great extent, still is practiced today, for the most part in private European studios with young children. Although attempts to have this program adopted as a basic program in the elementary schools of both Germany and Austria have been consistently supported, the Orff Institute for the training of teachers in Salzburg, Austria, is still the major public support for the program in Europe. Before reviewing the influence of the Orff program on the elementary public school music program of the United States, it might be advisable to briefly outline the basic tenets of the Orff approach.

There has been much controversy over the basic philosophy of Carl Orff's program. Early interpreters, especially educators from distinguished universities abroad and those in official education ministries in Europe, gave credence to the implication that the Orff program was based on the theory of the recapitulation of the race. Werner Thomas of Heidelberg University stated in a 1961 lecture:

> The most significant features of Orff-Schulwerk are these: (1) Every child as it grows passes through the various stages of development of the human race as a whole. Therefore for the earliest stage in the child's development, Orff chooses the oldest forms of speech to be found in folklore, legend and rhyme, because these best correspond with the child's mental capacity at this stage. In Schulwerk, speech is enriched, brought to life, over the foundation of an orchestra of keyed and percussion instruments. The rhythmic pulse of the instruments permeates the speech. They come together into being, as it were for the first time, as a world of sound. This new life is a synthesis of sound, image, and meaning. (2) The limitation of music to its earliest and fundamental forms and techniques also best corresponds with the mental capacity of the child in the earliest stages of its development. The choice of fundamental musical forms results from the predominance of speech in Schulwerk. Speaker, singer, and instrumentalist participate together in shaping the development of this combination of speech and music. Practice in improvisation is closely related to these fundamental forms. (3) Instruments based on a diatonic system are most suitable to the early stages of the child's development. The child practices with elementary models and patterns, which can then be developed through improvisation. The predominance of rhythm is not a sign of primitiveness, but an indication that the whole person, in body, mind, and spirit, is involved.[58]

The controversy was fanned to flame by the criticism of American music educator Marion Flagg who also reported Orff as supporting a "recapitulation of the race" theory:

---

[58] Excerpt from a lecture delivered in 1961 at the Mozarteum in Salzburg, Austria, on the occasion of the opening of the Zentralstelle and Seminary for the Orff-Schulwerk; copy of the translation given to this writer by Carl Orff in 1967.

> The real issue of the Orff system or method is that it is simply out of tune with today's world. The child, for whose musical growth education is responsible, does not come to instruction as a blank page to be written in step by tiny step through any historical reenactment.[59]

Orff felt it necessary to clarify the origin, stages of development, philosophy, and goals of Schulwerk:

> Schulwerk did not develop from any preconsidered plan--I could never have imagined such a far-reaching one--but it came from a need that I was able to recognize as such.... Every phase of Schulwerk will always provide stimulation for new independent growth; therefore it is never conclusive and settled, but always developing, always growing, always flowering.[60]

In conversation, Orff stated:

> I am not a man of theories; I have never thought along these lines. I was just unhappy with pedagogy in music in my native country. If others choose to read theories into Schulwerk, that is of no consequence to me. In Schulwerk, the sequence of musical activities and musical materials has been determined only in terms of discovery of needs to be fulfilled and ways and means of fulfilling these needs; the growth of ideas and plans, utilized in the Schulwerk, did not come from theories, but from practice and from concern with artistic points of view.[61]

Briefly, Orff's basic premises can be summarized as follows:

1. Music is basic to all learning.
2. Music education must begin with elemental factors; these include movement, speech, song, and instruments, all of which

---

[59] Marion Flagg, "The Orff System in Today's World," Music Educators Journal, December, 1966, p. 30.

[60] Carl Orff, "Orff-Schulwerk: Past and Future," in Perspectives in Music Education: Source Book III, (Washington, D. C.: MENC, 1966), p. 386.

[61] Personal conversations with Carl Orff at the Orff Institute in Salzburg, Austria, February, 1967.

include rhythm, melody, and harmony.

3. Music "for" children is best created "by" children.
4. Music "for" children is a plan of helping children "discover" music, not a superimposed plan of composition invented for learning.
5. The Orff idea is directed toward "experiencing" music rather than developing skills and techniques.
6. The ultimate goal of Orff-Schulwerk is true understanding of musical language and musical expression.

Orff was not thinking of an education in music for the gifted child. He asserts repeatedly that music is for all children and that his experience has taught him that completely unmusical children are very rare and that:

> nearly every child is at some point accessible and educable; but some teachers' ineptitude has often, through ignorance, nipped musicianship in the bud, repressed the gifted, and caused other disaster.[62]

Personal observations of Orff-Schulwerk at the Institute for Teacher Training in Salzburg, Austria, and demonstration classes in Europe and the United States bring out the following basic factors:

1. Orff-Schulwerk is not a method; it is an approach, a way, a path, a road, a direction.
2. The architectural structure of Schulwerk delineates a kind of learning, but does not direct a step-by-step system of musical learning as other programs do. It is simply a framework within

---

[62] Carl Orff, Perspectives in Music Education, op. cit., p. 390.

which certain operations lead to musical experiences which in turn lead to learning in music.

3. The successful music teacher utilizing the Orff approach must have resourcefulness and should be rich in initiative and background experiences in both music and movement.
4. Many methods may be utilized in the Orff approach, and two teachers may use different specific methods, yet be directed toward the same goal (music reading, for example).
5. The Orff approach is not now, and never will be, completely formalized.
6. Although five extensive volumes of musical material (from the very simplest to very complex) were developed by Orff and his associates, the entire emphasis of the Orff-Schulwerk is upon creativity; misunderstanding and criticism have resulted from interpreting the musical materials as arbitrary sequences.

Music educators also contend that "Music for Children" is taught with these materials entirely by rote, and children have no opportunity to develop creativity or improvisational ability. Orff answers this charge by saying that in order to express oneself creatively, one must have some facility with the language of music, and that these initial exercises are meant only for the development of initial musical skills and the introduction of creative ideas. He repeats that understanding the basic elements of music--balance and form--and participating in the production of music can develop the sense for musicality and creativity. And he states that his "Music for Children" is meant to be a general exposition of ways children "discover" music, not a superimposed plan of compositions invented for "learning" music.[63]

Besides the five volumes of musical materials, Orff-Schulwerk has also produced recordings, films, and instruments for use in Orff music classes. It must be emphasized that although the Orff instruments are very highly developed and costly, Orff himself frequently stated that it was not necessary to use those particular instruments, that any simple instruments with which the same results could be gained could be entirely satisfactory.

Today, there are Orff-Schulwerk enthusiasts all over the world; many of them have studied at the government-sponsored Orff Institute in Salzburg, Austria, and others have had training courses taught by Orff specialists at various universities in Europe and America. In the United States, Orff-Schulwerk has had tremendous growth in actual usage. Further, the development of Orff associations--centers for the dissemination of information--both on the West Coast and in the Midwest are noteworthy. ESEA Title III monies were devoted to Orff projects in several districts in the United States; while the allocation of these monies has, for the most part, ceased, the training programs that were developed are reflected in the universities (notably in those offering instruction in Orff-Schulwerk in summer sessions and extension courses) and in the work of teachers who are using the Orff approaches. Just how extensive this program is, particularly in the elementary schools of the nation, is one major phase of inquiry to which this study was directed.

---

[63] Personal conversations with Carl Orff at the Orff Institute in Salzburg, Austria, March, 1967.

The Program of Zoltán Kodály

The commendable results of music instruction in the elementary schools of Hungary have attracted worldwide attention. Many scholars in music education have traveled to Hungary to visit the Budapest Ferenc Liszt Music Academy's teacher training program and have, in the elementary music classes in the schools, observed: (1) outstanding music reading skills in small children; (2) much enthusiasm in every class; (3) exceptional vocal quality; (4) very advanced part singing in early grades; (5) an individualized instrumental training program for any child who wishes it; and (6) an extensive series of Sunday children's concerts exceedingly well attended. The success of the Hungarian program in elementary music education is attributed to the work of two eminent composers, Béla Bartók and Zoltán Kodály. Both regarded the task of advancing Hungarian musical education as equal in importance to their own creative and research activities. It was Kodály who said, "Nobody is too great to write for the small. In fact, one should strive to be big enough for it."[64]

The results of this work of Bartók and Kodály may be seen in the nationally organized plan for music instruction in Hungary: beginning with the youngest "public" school child, the program is designed to train the future audiences of Hungary as well as future professionals in music. The national network of music schools and teacher training institutions has been built upon a definite plan developed by these two composers who dreamt of musical literacy for the entire nation. Their influence was felt not only in the nationally-oriented music programs but in other areas of learning as well.

---

[64] Quotation taken from printed program, The Role of Music in Education: A Conference with Zoltán Kodály, Santa Barbara, California, August 2-3, 1966.

> The value of their works on the teaching of music was inestimable in the fields of art and education. The force of their ideas and the methods devised to express them were strong enough to overcome the frustrating effects of social conditions in Hungary before the Second World War and compel recognition, achieving a considerable success in disseminating a knowledge of music, popularizing it, and broadening its educational influence.[65]

Early in the twentieth century Kodály and Bartók undertook the scientific chore of collecting, transcribing, classifying, and publishing the folk songs of Hungary. In so doing they visited outlying areas throughout Hungary and in a few years they had noted or recorded several thousand melodies. A number of young ethnomusicologists soon followed this lead. There now exists in Hungary the Folk Music Research Institute which, till his death, was headed by Kodály, and in which are collected approximately 100,000 Hungarian melodies.

The result of this massive research, systematic classification, and analysis of groups, types, styles, difficulties, etc., has been the development of an educational format of musical learning based on the treasury of traditional Hungarian folk music. It is stated by Hungarian musicologists that most of the master composers of the twentieth century have felt that musical development arrived at a crucial point and that there was no outlet leading from the chromaticism of Tristan. While Schöenberg, Webern, and Berg, creators of the new Viennese school, developed a strict theoretical system, most composers of that period realized that the "new" would be a renaissance of something that had existed long before. Soon pentatonic and old modal tunes as well as old harmonic formulae began to appear in twentieth century composition. Added to this were, of course, unusual rhythms, new pulsations, and different structural outlines so that the new forms began to replace the Romanticism of the past where harmonies were mostly dictated by melodies. In Kodály and Bartók these musical developments took on special significance in that both of them identified themselves and their music with the folk songs of their own people. Bartók's music began to take on a national aspect; Kodály's, a historical perspective. Both concentrated on the musical and literary past of Hungary. Although the two great musicians were different in personality and approach, the basis of their art was still the Hungarian folk music. The masterpieces of these two great composers drew many followers and, in the '30s, a cult of folk music began to develop with unprecedented rapidity among educated musicians and young people. The movement drew great strength from Kodály and Bartók, both of whom wrote articles and delivered lectures defending the inclusion of folk music as part of the highest art forms in music. The aim of musically educating all the people was formulated by Kodály who himself planned the campaign with his pupils. He formulated ideas of the music of the millions--the folk music--in an extensive plan for a musical education of all Hungary's children.

---

[65] Frigyes Sandor, Ed., Musical Education in Hungary, (London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1966), p. 9.

Kodály had a definite philosophy of music education. He sincerely believed that only the spirit of singing could save man from becoming a machine in this age of mechanization. He stated frequently that mankind would live more happily when it embraced the values of music, and that whoever worked to promote this end would find concomitant rewards.

Further, Kodály felt that the first musical language of the young child in music must be his own. This was not only because most children are more familiar with the songs of their nursery years and folk background, nor because folk music would function as a national music culture, but because where a teaching method was being considered, folk music had much to recommend it as a basis for musical education. Kodály offered several reasons for this proposition:

1. Folk music was a simpler, more naive mode of expression than the art song or other forms.
2. The texts were more closely related to children's interests.
3. Its chief scale (in Hungary, five notes without semitones) could be sung easily and well in tune.
4. Its simple forms lead gradually into more complex art forms in easy succession.

According to Kodály's plan, a complete course of study beginning in the earliest primary years is now available in practical form. Most of the melodies used in nursery schools and general schools are folk songs, but melodies that are conceived in the spirit of folk music, i.e., those that resemble folk music in form and scale, in melodic and rhythmic formulae, are also used. The folk musics of other peoples are included as well in the Hungarian music education syllabus. And the teaching pieces of both Bartók and Kodály are seen on every grade level in the children's music books.

Kodály was very strongly opposed to what he called "artificially contrived teaching pieces," and he suggested a keen analysis of musical materials in order to help build potential artistic experiences, from the simplest to the most complex:

> Sometimes a single artistic experience opens the soul of the young to music. The advent of such an experience should not be left to chance. It is up to the schools to provide the child with it.
>
> Let us discard the pedagogic superstition which holds that artistically diluted and artificially contrived teaching material reaches the child best.[66]

Respectively, attention to use of the human voice and then the development of aural skills through the use of the voice were very important to Kodály. He argued the worth of this format as a basis for all music instruction: designed for both the future audience and the future professional. In a 1966 conference at Santa Barbara, California, Kodály stressed this point with a group of American professionals who had originally developed their instrumental music skills in the conservatories of Hungary; these musicians stated they had never developed singing skills or vocal reading skills. Kodály insisted this was a great mistake. In one of his last speeches to the students of the Budapest Academy of Music at the end of the academic year, he defined what he meant by a good musician. His starting point was a work called "Musical Maxims for Home and Life," written by Robert Schumann a hundred or so years before:

> Aural training is absolutely essential.... Try and recognize notes and keys as young as possible.... However small your voice may be, try singing from written music, without the help of an instrument.... Do plenty of choral singing, choosing chiefly inner parts; that will make you an ever-better musician.... Listen carefully to folksongs;

---

[66] Quotations taken from Kodály printed program, ibid., 1966.

> they are a treasure trove of beautiful melodies, and through them you will get to know the national character of many people.[67]

According to Mme. Erzsébet Szönyi, present director of the Liszt Academy, Kodály discussed these principles at great length and in them summarized the essence of the Hungarian sol-fa teaching. In Kodály's view, she said, "a good musician can be described under four heads. He has: (1) a trained ear, (2) a trained intellect, (3) a trained heart, and (4) trained hands." These four need to be developed simultaneously, according to more recent thinking in Hungarian educational circles. They need to be kept in constant equalibrium. Trouble is caused if one is overdeveloped or neglected. Training in the first two, ear and intellect, is achieved through sol-fa, to which is now linked the study of harmony and form.

> During the last few decades these principles have been more and more vigorously applied in Hungarian music teaching. Ear training is as important for a child as learning to play an instrument. A state of equipose between the two must be achieved if the child is to receive an all-round musical education.[68]

Many music educators from the United States have gone to Hungary to study the Kodály program and understand its implications. Many of them have initiated studies and developed programs based upon the philosophy and the methodology of the Hungarian system. Under its Arts and Humanities Program, the 1971 Office of Education Report on Research

---

[67] Quoted by Erzsébet Szönyi in a welcoming speech to an American group of Oregon students and teachers visiting the Liszt Academy of Music; Budapest, Hungary; April, 1967.

[68] Erzsébet Szönyi, "Sol-Fa Teaching in Musical Education," in Musical Education in Hungary, op. cit., p. 25.

Projects listed a study still in progress utilizing Kodály's method for developing musical literacy.[69] Many other studies under the sponsorship of the ESEA, Title III, have been completed. The popularity of the Kodály summer session courses at the various universities and the use of the Richards adaptations of the Kodály methods[70] attest to the continued interest in Kodály in the United States.

> The unexpected and almost overwhelming success of Mrs. Richards' adaptation of the Kodály method has led to a rash of publications emphasizing sightsinging. Some of these are little more than attempts to cash in on the Kodály name, with scant attention to the method beyond such obvious techniques as hand singing. Others are nothing more than the traditional graded songbooks with a curious structure of sol-fa syllables, numbers, color cueing, and note letter names added in varying degrees of subject-logic sequence.
>
> In any case, the trend in recent elementary music texts has been away from music just for fun and toward some sort of sequential development of basic concepts and skills.[71]

Questionable to the music educator in Hungary is Richards' adaptation. Liszt Academy instructors say they doubt that a general "classroom teacher who has not been trained as a music specialist will find the Richards method particularly valuable,"[72] and that the children will develop music reading skills comparable to the children in Hungary with this sequence of musical material.

---

[69] Arts and Humanities Program, Report on Research Projects, 1971; U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Office of Education, Publication No. OE 72-17.

[70] Mary Helen Richards, Threshold to Music, (Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1964); Songs in Motion, (same publishers, 1965); two books published by Fearon in 1966: Teaching Music Through Songs, Hand Singing, and Inner Hearing and The Fourth Year (continuation of Threshold to Music.

[71] Lois Choksy, "Kodály, In and Out of Context," Music Educators Journal, April, 1969, p. 57.

[72] Wolfgang Kuhn, Threshold to Music, op. cit., Foreword.

There is a considerable difference between the Orff "approach" and the Kodály "method." Orff is dedicated to the development of musicality in children through the simultaneous approaches of speech, movement, and music by the use of methods that are found most adaptive; Kodály is dedicated to the development of musicality by a scientifically developed, step-by-step method for the development of skills in reading and in making music. In a comparison of Orff and Kodály (1969), Denise Bacon asserted that she had originally intended to divide her time evenly between the Kodály and Orff concepts in Europe, but discovered that the Kodály concept was both more far-reaching and more time-consuming to learn properly.

> Orff is susceptible to great modification and transformation as it is adapted in different sections of our country and other countries, mostly because it is basically unstructured and cannot be put into a mold; also, that success with Orff depends heavily on the giftedness and imagination of the teacher.
>
> I perceived immediately that the Kodály cannot be learned at random; it must be studied thoroughly and sequentially.[73]

The Kodály method is based on the fundamental premise that no one can teach music who is not trained in music. Today, any Hungarian teacher who teaches any phase of music in any school in Hungary has been trained in the Kodály method. In Hungary, there is no such thing as a teacher of music not having passed the qualifying examinations in music.

> Music is an academic discipline in Hungary and is part of the core curriculum. It took Kodály fifty years to achieve the incredible standard of music literacy that presently exists. The average man

---

[73] Denise Bacon, Kodály and Orff: Report from Europe," Music Educators Journal, April, 1969, p. 53.

> or woman on the street up to the age of about twenty-eight can read and write music as easily as his own language.[74]

How extensive the Kodály method is in the elementary schools of the United States was a point of investigation of this 1972 survey; by the end of the '60s there was an obvious drop in the number of articles appearing in print related to the Kodály method in the United States. Since 1970, none have appeared in the Music Educators Journal.

The Program of Shinichi Suzuki

Thousands of music educators and professional musicians have been both thrilled and astonished at the sight and sound of very young violinists (from about three to twelve or thirteen) playing Bach, Mozart, Vivaldi, etc., from memory, in a most professional manner. Internationally known violin virtuosi have also heard these children and have been equally astonished at their technical skills, quality of tone, and general performance. These young violinists from the 200 some studios of Shinichi Suzuki in Japan are not just a few isolated "little fiddlers" being displayed: they have been seen and heard as individuals, in small and large groups performing in unison the standard violin literature of master composers; they have also been recognized as educationally representative of average Japanese children. As a matter of fact, all this reflects one of the basic tenets of the Suzuki philosophy:

> Man is born with natural ability. A newborn child adjusts to his environment in order to live.... Many children grow up in an environment that stunts and damages them, and it is assumed that they are born that way, and they themselves believe it too. But

---

[74] Ibid., p. 54.

> they are wrong.[75]
>
> I believe that culture is merely a part of man's environment and nothing more.... I believe that environment changes man and that occasionally hereditary changes have come about because of human physiological adaptation, thus actually creating the history of human life.[76]
>
> We must investigate methods through which all children can develop their talents. In a way, this may be more important than investigation of atomic power.[77]

Walter Hendl, director of the Eastman School of Music in Rochester, New York, states the basic tenets of the Suzuki philosophy in his own words:

> 1. Every child can be educated.
> 2. Education begins from the day of birth.
> 3. If love of music expression is deep, much can be accomplished.[78]

With Suzuki, love is very deep; his affection for and devotion to the children dominates his entire life. His ultimate goal, he says, is to help the children find emotionally satisfying aesthetic expression in music and he has built a strong network of Talent Education Studios throughout Japan to this end. Through these studios, he keeps the closest possible contact:

---

[75] Shinichi Suzuki, Nurtured by Love, (New York: Exposition Press, Inc., 1969), Preface, p. 7.

[76] Personal conversations with Shinichi Suzuki; Matsumoto, Japan; October, 1967.

[77] Ibid.

[78] Walter Hendl, from a speech delivered on the occasion of a Tokyo Talent Education Concert presenting 2,000 violinists, 'cellists, etc., March 26, 1967; copy given to the investigator by Shinichi Suzuki at Matsumoto, Japan, in October, 1967.

1. Every teacher in every studio has been a pupil of Suzuki and has graduated from his Talent Education Institute in Matsumoto. Every teacher has had a program of tailored instruction for specific training according to an analysis of his own background, strengths, and weaknesses. Each teacher is adequately prepared to undertake the responsibilities and the challenges of using the Suzuki method in teaching violin to young children.
2. Every student in every studio has, in several ways, also been a pupil of Suzuki. His progress is continuously reviewed and recorded by means of tapes sent to Suzuki for comments and recommendations. In a letter to this investigator dated January 12, 1973, Waltraud Suzuki (wife of Shinichi Suzuki) stated, "Mr. Suzuki is very busy listening to the graduation tapes. This year there may be about 4,000."

The Suzuki method has frequently been called the "mother tongue" method simply because Suzuki believes that children should learn to play musical instruments in the same way they learn their native language--by listening and learning. As a means of realizing both philosophy and goals, Suzuki brings into involvement the mother, often the father, and, as far as possible, the entire family. Exposure to music as early as possible and excellent models for imitation are two of his strongest pedagogical recommendations.

It is interesting to note that Professor Malcolm G. Douglass, professor of education at Claremont Graduate School, thinks that "reading" cannot be taught directly, and that the schools should stop trying to do the impossible. This notion lends support to Suzuki's method. At the 40th annual Claremont reading conference, Douglass gave the keynote address and said, in part:

> The ability to read is not enhanced by teaching about reading.... Reading is something that must be learned indirectly as a personal, private sort of experience. The most effective approach to get children to read is to surround them by a wide variety of reading material, stimulate their thinking with ideas, and expose them to interesting subject matter.[79]

Kodály would begin the child's musical training with the human instrument--the voice--and teach music reading with solmization, while Suzuki would use the violin and defer music reading. There are, however, similar features in the two programs. Both state that their primary purpose is to give all children the opportunity to develop their own musicality; both have organized step-by-step methods and instructional programs for both students and teachers; both have directed their efforts toward quality in the development of skills; both have addressed themselves to the individual child even when instructed in a group; both have stressed skills without the use of the piano as a crutch; and both have directed their efforts to the acceptance of their programs on a national scale. In Hungary, the Kodály method of music instruction is used in all the schools. In Japan, the ministry of education has set up two commissions to study the educational implications of the Suzuki philosophy for general education and to plan a program of pilot exploration in the schools. Suzuki himself has gone a step further in an appeal to representatives of the United Nations to live up to the ideals of the Children's Charter: to provide not only care but education for every child, and "education for every child" to him includes music education.[80]

---

[79] "Stop Trying to Teach Reading--Just Let It Happen, Expert Says," (editorial), Los Angeles Times, Sunday, February 25, 1973, Part I, p. 3.

The teacher's needs for a rich background in music and for creative ingenuity in carrying out the learning program are points of similarity shared by the Suzuki, the Orff, and the Kodály programs. Although the routine and the formalities of each class or studio may be followed according to the particular program, the need for instantaneous resourcefulness to apply to problems large and small is alike in each program. The "correct" exercise to develop a difficult skill or the "correct" game to illustrate the solution to a problem demand the same kind of ingenuity from each teacher with each program. Success in each of the programs demands teacher flexibility and creativity. Although each of the Talent Education Studios follows the same routine as a skeleton or framework for instruction, each child and each problem is treated individually.

Music educators in America first became aware of the phenomenal success of the Suzuki training program in 1958; many since have gone to Matsumoto, Japan, to learn the methods and to understand the Suzuki philosophy; many attend the summer session there now taught in English.

> Twenty years of Talent Education.... And without my realizing it, the movement also became a sensation in America, where it now is being more and more widely accepted, and on a greater scale than in Japan.... The first people to take action were Professor Kendall of the music department of Muskingum College (Ohio) and

---

[80] Shinichi Suzuki, Nurtured by Love, op. cit., p. 119.

Professor Clifford Cook of Oberlin.[81]

By 1966 the MENC and the American String Teachers Association had both sponsored Suzuki demonstrations in America, and there were many private violin studios and public school string classes devoted to the Suzuki method. John Kendall had adopted the Suzuki violin series of instruction books, and many teachers of public school string classes in both elementary and junior high grades were now utilizing Suzuki's ideas and some of his materials. ESEA funded several projects.

> In Charlotte, North Carolina, more than 100 elementary schools began using the Kendall *Listen and Play* approach in September, 1962, with a unison spring festival as a goal. In Dallas, Texas, the method has been used in connection with teaching bowing styles. In St. Louis, the Catholic school system has combined the *Listen and Play* ideas with other materials in two schools--one in an underprivileged area, the other in a high-middle-income area. In De Kalb, Illinois, "Saturday Strings" supplements the teaching in the grades.[82]

Interest in Suzuki's philosophy continued to intrigue American educators. Many private teachers adopted his violin methods and began teaching very young children, an idea novel to the American violin teacher who had always held that nine or ten was early enough. Several universities and music schools in the country began training programs utilizing the Suzuki method. In 1966 the Eastman School of Music began its "Project SUPER" (Suzuki-Penfield-Eastman-Rochester) under a grant from the New York State Council on the Arts. Programs were also begun at the University of Tennessee and at the Southern Illinois University in

---

[81] *Ibid.*, p. 115.

[82] John Kendall, "The Resurgent String Program in America," in *Perspectives in Music Education: Source Book III*, (Washington, D. C.: MENC, 1966), p. 394.

Edwardsville; in these latter two programs graduate students did the teaching under faculty supervision. By 1972 there was widespread interest in the Suzuki philosophy and methods; American Suzuki institutes were organized at Wisconsin State College, Holy Names College, and at several other universities and colleges. To broaden the scope and intensity of activities developing around the Suzuki philosophy, American music educators in the summer of 1972 formed the Suzuki Association of the Americas with the intent of including members from both North and South America.

Although the Suzuki movement is very strong in Japan and perhaps is growing even stronger in America, there still remain critics in both countries as well as in other nations. Respect for Suzuki as a great teacher remains constant, but disagreement with his philosophies and his objectives is frequently evidenced by professional musicians. Some object to his mass performances as being sensational; some object to a cultural transplant as being only a temporary fad.

One of the most severely criticized features of the Suzuki program is the place of music reading. Suzuki defers all instruction in reading until the child has developed fundamental skills on the instrument. Some educators and professional musicians remain skeptical toward any program that would allow children to play instruments before they could read music. To this, Suzuki answers that just as it is not necessary for the child to learn grammar or to read words before he learns to speak, the child should develop naturally, first things first; this means expressing himself with his instrument and listening for tone and quality, watching for natural movement, coordination, and physical control.[83] Despite the "reading" criticism, however, Suzuki's students have proved that they do learn to read even if they do not learn as early as Kodály's pupils. Suzuki's ability to analyze, verbalize, demonstrate, and adapt the "language learning" technique to the teaching of violin has enabled young children to develop: (1) a complete mastery of extraordinarily fine string literature; (2) amazing musical memory; (3) accurate intonation on a very difficult instrument; (4) remarkable skill of both right and left hands; (5) artistic concepts of interpretation; and (6) a most professional style of performance. Furthermore, the basic goals of the program and the specific teaching techniques and methods are highly adaptive to all other instruments.

In 1967, when this researcher was in Matsumoto, children as young as 18 months and as old as 13 years were observed in individual violin, 'cello, piano, and koto lessons; in small ensemble training sessions twice a week; and in frequent evening recitals. All students, beginning and advanced, participated at the training center as well as at all of the studios visited. Master classes for future soloists and individual coaching sessions for artist performers brought violinists to the institute from many corners of the world. String quartets and larger string ensembles could be heard in rehearsal and in performance many evenings, especially over the weekends. Visiting artists were many, and the opportunity for the students to discuss technical passages and specific techniques with the artists was unrestricted. An air of joyful music-making on the part of all students seemed to dominate the institute.

---

[83] Walter Targ, violinist with the Minneapolis Symphony Orchestra, supports the Suzuki position and says that his students advance at a greater rate (than those taught with traditional methods) with the use of the Suzuki method.

The pleasures of making music were obvious to this observer in the visits to the Orff and Kodály programs as well. Each of these three programs seemed to capture the delights of musical involvement; children were exceedingly happy with their music-making in all three settings.

CMP (Contemporary Music Project)

It was the contemporary composer Norman Dello Joio's idea of placing young composers in public schools of the United States that motivated the 1959 Young Composers Project, sponsored by the Ford Foundation and later sponsored jointly by the MENC. Between 1959 and 1969, 73 young composers were granted fellowships under the MENC-Ford Foundation Contemporary Music Project. They worked as resident composers in 77 secondary schools in selected locations, composing music especially tailored to fit the needs and abilities of music performance groups in the schools. Before the ten-year period had elapsed, CMP began to realize that larger reforms in education suggested a revision of the original concept in order to meet the changing needs of music education.

In April, 1965, the CMP held a seminar at Northwestern University during which the principle of comprehensive musicianship as a foundation for a college education in music was developed.

> As a result of this Seminar, CMP organized the Institute for Music in Contemporary Education (ICME); these experimental programs and subsequent workshops fostered a national impetus for reevaluation, and continue to provide a focus for the efforts of numerous

individuals and institutions.[84]

CMP directed much of its attention and resources during the next four years, 1966 until 1970, toward the development of attitudes and of processes that might encourage a more comprehensive education of students in the broadest possible perspective of music.

> The college music curriculum has been the primary concern since it was felt that this was the most natural juncture in the total educational process.[85]

In 1968 a new five-year project was announced. In this new development CMP attempted to serve as an agent to make the musician's work more relevant to the society as a whole; CMP's new plan called for "resident professionals" (composers, performers, and scholars) to live in assigned communities for a minimum of two years and to be readily available to serve musical and cultural needs of all the institutions in the communities. During this new phase of the CMP it was also made a goal to identify imaginative and capable individual teachers at all levels and to widen the scope of their influences by publication of their works, by workshops in which they participated, and by in-service programs that utilized their gifts. The new emphasis on the teacher gave the CMP an opportunity to assist the individual musician in developing priorities and setting goals.

The project's deepest concern during its early history had been with the education of future musicians; its new concern had given rise to the term "comprehensive musicianship"; now CMP sought to advance this latter cause by even more extensive publication, more experimental pilot projects, and, recently, by the addition of the Institutes for Music in Contemporary Education.

---

[84] CMP Newsletter, Volume 2, No. 1, Fall, 1970, (Washington, D. C.: MENC), p. 2.

[85] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

The Fall, 1970, Newsletter of the CMP announced the appointment of three composers for Program I (the placement of resident musicians in selected communities) and the awarding of seven teacher grants for Program II (the teaching of comprehensive musicianship) to teachers of public schools and colleges in order to help them develop materials and techniques for implementing more comprehensive curricula. Of the seven grants, two were to teachers in the elementary area: one was to develop approaches and materials (first through fifth grades) for use by students as well as for programs for the in-service training of nonspecialist teachers; the other teacher was to develop a comprehensive music curriculum (for elementary education majors) which could also be applied for use with their students in the elementary schools. All other projects were directed toward the secondary level. Music curricula were still the paramount concern, and a conference on college music curricula was held in October of 1970.[86]

Since that time the CMP has indicated a continuing desire to prevent its programs and activities from being isolated from general practice; it has evaluated its "comprehensive musicianship" and reevaluated its goals. The most recent Newsletter (Winter, 1973) was concerned with the presentation of suggested means for developing a "bridge between the student's technical expertise in performance and his development as a discriminating listener." Not to be misinterpreted as a position ~~of~~ anti-performance, the suggestion stipulated "more comprehensive musical experiences that contain all three basic musicianly functions of analysis, creativity, and performance."[87] A very interesting justification for music in the schools made its appearance in this Newsletter:

---

[86] Ibid., pp. 2 and 3.

> The primary reason for music in the schools is to provide a function in the total education of our students that cannot be provided by any other experience available in their school life. Any other reason for its existence in the curriculum is probably a duplication of something that can already be done better through other school experiences. Viewed in this way, music--and the other arts--offer the student a means of expression not otherwise available.[88]

The programs and the projects of the CMP for the most part, have been concerned with the secondary levels. Their contributions, however, are more specifically in three areas of music: (1) the sponsoring of fellowships for young composers to service the needs of communities; (2) the sponsoring of conferences for comprehensive musicianship (including forums, seminars, workshops, university summer session courses, in-service training sessions, etc.); and (3) the sponsoring of materials for performance classes and teachers by publication of books for teaching, catalogues of the results of the contemporary fellowships and their creative work, materials for performance groups (vocal, orchestral, and band), and a film (20 minutes, 16 mm./sound, in color with a teacher's guide) introducing or reviewing the elements of music "suitable from elementary through college."

---

[87] CMP Newsletter, Volume 4, No. 2, Winter, 1973, (Washington, D. C.: MENC), p. 1.

[88] Ibid., p. 1.

MMCP (Manhattanville Music Curriculum Project)

Sponsored from 1965 through 1970 by the Arts and Humanities Program of the United Stated Office of Education, the MMCP developed curricula for sequential learning from pre-kindergarten through grade twelve. The major projects of the MMCP are Interaction, an early childhood music learning plan, and Synthesis, a structured music education plan for grades three through twelve.[89] The two curricula are conceived on the same philosophical basis and are very closely related, yet each has its own place, purpose, and plan. Following is a chart (developed by the investigator) showing some of their differences in perspective and stress:

	Interaction (Pre-K - 3)	Synthesis (3 - 12)
Goals and experiences	Process-oriented; personal involvement; discovery.	Concept- and skills-oriented; experience in the processes of musicianship.
Sequence	Of no genuine concern; some in the processes of exploration; uses DPMC (developmental phases of musical exploration).	Flexible sequence; spiral curriculum of musical concepts.
Focus	Predominately on sounds, music in aural forms. Little emphasis on notation of any kind.	Symbolic references; all types of notation as well as aural reality of music.
Instructor	Can be taught successfully and implemented by the classroom teacher with the assistance of specialist.	Requires the teacher to be knowledgeable in music.

It is interesting to note that MMCP not only says that the child's musical explorations and discoveries can be guided by the classroom teacher, but it affirms that in most cases they should be: "Children can be offered a much broader range of musical development. Musical experience can be more thoroughly integrated with the many activities which make up the child's school day."[90]

---

[89] Ronald B. Thomas, MMCP Interaction, (New York: Media Materials, Inc., 1969), p. v.

Interaction is based upon the research of Piaget and Bruner and upon the taxonomy of Bloom. Its basic theses are supported with a rationale that explains creativity in the child, logic of discovery for the child, and symbolism for the child. Interaction outlines the shape of the curriculum and presents developmental phases of musical exploration, referred to throughout as the DPME, as follows:

Phase I: Free exploration
Phase II: Guided exploration
Phase III: Exploratory improvisation
Phase IV: Planned improvisation
Phase V: Reapplication

"The DPME is the operational framework of Interaction,"[91] and the presentation of curriculum operations is followed by examples of specific operational plans that follow the five phases in detail.

Synthesis[92] follows even more closely the work of Bruner and Bloom. In considering his educational objectives, Bloom thoroughly outlined the cognitive, affective, and the psychomotor domains; Thomas categorizes his objectives as cognitive, attitudinal, aptitudinal, and aesthetic. The curriculum itself stresses the educational environment and focuses on discovery, on concepts, on skills, on "today," and on "totality." The shape of the curriculum is "spiral" in its strategies.

---

[90] Ibid., p. vi.

[91] Ibid., p. 25.

[92] Ronald B. Thomas, Synthesis, (New York: Media Materials, Inc., 1969).

Both programs are concerned with the student as well as with subject matter. MMPC has carefully considered the relevance of the materials in terms of artistic relevance, personal relevance, and social relevance. How extensively these materials are being used in the elementary public schools of the United States was of great interest to this research.

The final report on the Manhattanville Project was submitted by Thomas at the conclusion of the federally-sponsored project.[93] It was found that: (1) immediate attention and radical thought are needed for the college experiences of those who are going into music education; (2) priority for creative research in areas of musical ability should be recognized; (3) individual research should be steered toward investigating the learning results of the MMCP study; and (4) conferences should be arranged to carry out some of the basic ideas of the project. All of the feasibility studies reported showed promise in the areas of instrumental programs, keyboard studies, and the science-music projects. Further conferences and studies on the college level have already begun.[94]

---

[93] Ronald Thomas, Manhattanville Music Curriculum Project (6-1999; ED 045 865), July, 1966-September, 1970; Reports on Research Projects, 1971; U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Office of Education, (Washington, D. C.: DHEW Publication No. (OE) 72-17).

YMC (Yale Music Curriculum)

The Yale Seminar (June, 1963) had explored six areas of music education from kindergarten through twelfth grade: (1) musicality, (2) repertory, (3) listening, (4) activities and courses, (5) professional and community resources, and (6) educational media as aids to teaching. The Yale Music Curriculum, written expressly for the secondary level, was a direct outgrowth of the seminar. (The Juilliard Repertory cited later was another.) Each unit of study in the YMC (the opera, for example) analyzed in detail major works of certain periods and illustrated particular forms. Founded on the conviction that a work of art is not an isolated object, but is fully revealed only by knowing all that contributed to its making, the Yale Music Curriculum proposed an in-depth methodology which would study both composer and composition; it then called for testing of its approach. Connecticut high schools undertook the testing assignment between 1967-68; teachers at a summer institute agreed to test it nationally, and in June of 1968 an evaluation conference took place. Another year of testing took place between 1968 and 1969. Since all of the studies have been done on the secondary level, they are not pertinent to this research. They are included here as innovative programs that gave rise to new ideas on the elementary level; the basic concepts are incorporated in other elementary programs that were motivated by the Yale Seminar and the Yale Music Curriculum. A full report of the Yale Seminar was published by the United States Office of

---

[94] MMCP College Curriculum Study, Journal of Research in Music Education, (Washington, D. C.: MENC), Volume XVII, Fall, 1969, No. 3, p. 348.

Education in 1964.[95] Educational materials are packaged for use and the entire report is available on microfiche.

CEMREL (Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, Inc.)

CEMREL is an aesthetic education program designed for children (kindergarten through twelfth grade) as part of their general education. It seeks

> to help students of various backgrounds understand and develop a "feeling" for sense, form, expression, and meaning in many aspects of life through study in the arts. The program is based on the idea that students should develop the ability to make informed aesthetic judgments so that they can participate actively in shaping the cultural life of the nation.[96]

In a recent letter to this investigator, Director Stanley S. Madeja states that the aesthetic education program has two main objectives:

> first, the production of aesthetic curriculum resources and dissemination of these products into school systems and second, continued research and development in related areas of aesthetic education.[97]
>
> The first objective is met through the planning, design, development and evaluation of instructional units. These units are designed to provide students with opportunities for aesthetic experiences and to teach them concepts with which they can begin to make conscious, informed judgments about those experiences. Instructional units consist of films, filmstrips, game boards, cards, etc.--whatever medium best transmits the aesthetic concepts to be learned. Concepts are organized into focal points--or centers of attention. On the elementary level these are: aesthetics and the physical world; aesthetics and the arts elements; and aesthetics and the creative process.[98]

---

[95] Claude V. Palisca, op. cit.

[96] News of Research; James A. Mason, editor, "Aesthetic Education Curriculum Program," Journal of Research in Music Education, Winter, 1968, Volume XVI, No. 4, p. 347.

[97] Stanley S. Madeja, letter regarding CEMREL, dated February 12, 1973.

[98] Ibid.

In addition, three centers of attention will augment those now in the intermediate and secondary grades. The program is written for nonarts classroom teachers, and each unit contains a teacher's guide and enough material for 30 students. Exemplars in each unit are drawn from one or more of the arts--film, theatre, literature, music, dance, and the visual arts. The program is working toward the realization of aesthetic education as an area of study within the general education of every child. The CEMREL Institute distributes many publications on aesthetic education and does not confine itself to those developed and published by the program. Bennett Reimer provides the expertise for the music education needs.

This investigation was particularly interested in learning whether elementary music educators across the land were cognizant of and using the materials developed by CEMREL. Music education, as it has changed through the years, has broadened its scope to the point where emphasis is no longer on the narrow, utilitarian functions of music; it has begun to understand the aesthetic implications for the child.

> The aesthetic experience, the abstract thread that ties music and man together, is becoming a highly sought end for many music educators.[99]

JRL (Juilliard Repertory Library)

Another direct outgrowth of the Yale Seminar was the three-year study undertaken at Juilliard under a grant from the United States Office of Education. The research made available to classroom teachers a collection of musical materials for kindergarten through sixth grade. The purpose of the project was to enrich existing materials and to provide works of greater variety related to historical era, ethnic validity, and musical scope. JRL has compiled an impressive amount of music to broaden children's musical repertoire. Music not as well known as that from the Classic and Romantic periods was studied extensively, and Pre-Renaissance, Renaissance, Baroque, and Contemporary literatures were added to the repertory. In its pilot programs, the Juilliard study found that the acceptance of the new music by the children depended upon the teacher's reaction to it. When they discovered the scarcity of Contemporary music for use in the schools, the Juilliard study commissioned 65 works from 30 contemporary composers. These materials, both for study and performance groups, were used in the experimental programs and were enthusiastically received.

---

[99] Carroll Gonzo, "Aesthetic Experience: A Coming of Age in Music Education," Music Educators Journal, December, 1971, p. 34.

The Hawaii Curriculum Center Music Project

A combined four-year study, from 1966 until 1970, involved the Hawaii Department of Education and the University of Hawaii in the music project that produced a sequential music curriculum for kindergarten through twelfth grade. Under the auspices of the Hawaii Curriculum Center of Honolulu, the project adopted as its general aims the creation of a

> logical, continuous education program ensuring the competent guidance of music education of all children in the state's public schools and ... [the testing and assembling] of the materials needed

by schools to realize this program.[100]

A team of music educators, aestheticians, composers, and theorists, performers, and curriculum specialists has worked on producing sequential curriculum packages (guides, workbooks, scores, testing materials, recordings, and tapes) for each level of instruction. Some characteristics of the project include:

1. formulation of a taxonomy of conceptual understandings basic to the structure of music
2. planning monitored by the Planning and Evaluation Review Technique (PERT), commonly used in business
3. an upgraded individualized approach based upon conceptual levels of understanding
4. behaviorally-oriented objectives, with appropriate evaluation techniques
5. development of materials and approaches using Western and non-Western musics, and musics of representative styles
6. trial projects, research, and testing in the University's Laboratory School and the single state-wide public school system (one state-wide school district)
7. an approach where all music from K-12 will be taught by music specialists, with each child receiving a minimum of 30 minutes of daily instruction
8. redefinition of content and approaches to courses such as "general music," "music appreciation," and "instrumental and/or

---

[100] William Thomson, "Music Rides the Wave of a Reform in Hawaii," Music Educators Journal, May, 1970, p. 73.

vocal performance" classes.[101]

This curriculum development shows most definitely the influence of Jerome Bruner. It uses a spiral structure in which the

> same basic matters are nourished year after year by progressing through a subject matter that, although changing, nonetheless reflects a basis in seven basic concepts. These basic concepts provide the thread of continuity with which to weave a spiral curriculum. New musical ideas, which could be called subconcepts, are the basis for every day learning.[102]
>
> The seven basic concepts that form the foundation of the new music curriculum are: (a) tone, (b) rhythm, (c) melody, (d) harmony, (e) form, (f) tonality, and (g) texture. Using these basic concepts as a formative canopy, it is possible to account for every other imaginable musical concept. This is not merely a matter of intellectual sorting and pigeon-holing; rather it is an essential step in achieving a relatively complete body of material that can provide an objective basis for learning in music over an extended period of time.[103]

The intent was to ensure that every student would be provided with an in-depth understanding of the seven basic musical concepts. These seven basic concepts were regarded as constants while the subconcepts were expected to change often and according to needs. In arranging the chronology of the taxonomy, care was taken to deal with student maturation and conceptual development. In this regard the schedule of groupings, called "zones," roughly resembles and parallels a traditional grade schedule, but it is not intended to be so structured. Stress is laid upon the fact that the six-part grouping into zones is only intended to represent levels of sophistication and that children may move at their own speed from zone to zone. The major work of the total curriculum is expected to be completed by June of 1973.

---

[101] James A. Mason, editor, News of Research: "The Hawaii Curriculum Center Music Project," Journal of Research in Music Education, Volume XVIII, No. 2, Summer, 1970, p. 184.

[102] William Thomson, op. cit., p. 76.

[103] Ibid., p. 77.

> There is no educational endeavor in any part of the country that quite equals the Hawaii Project in ambition, in scope, in the professional skill that is being lavished on the work, or in terms of its unique mode of operation. The mere fact that such an undertaking can exist in one of our state universities is a challenge to every other state's educational establishment. It is also a distinct testimony to the foresight of the people who made it possible. That a state is actually paying people to develop a music curriculum--not a "science" curriculum, but a "music" curriculum--is in itself a most invigorating and heady sign that our age of technology has not lost sight of some of the truly fundamental human needs.[104]

Music Education in Television

Despite the resistance on the part of music educators as a whole in accepting television as an effective means of music instruction, the growth of in-school music instruction via television has continued. This resistance or, at times, reluctance to support developmental programs through television can be traced to several predominate attitudes: television is too closely related to entertainment and not to learning ("Time to turn off the TV and get to work!"); children learn best in music by "making" music, not by observing others make music (Intercommunication or "talk back" systems have evidenced little or no effect on student achievement.);[105] and the needs of the individual child cannot be fulfilled through mass media. Music educators have never regarded educational television as a threat to their positions despite the report of the Hagerstown experiment to the effect that children reacted better to television instruction than formerly when such instruction was left to the classroom teacher, or the report of savings in teacher salaries.[106]

---

[104] *Ibid.*, p. 82.

[105] Thomas H. Carpenter, "TV--More Than a Talking Face," *Music Educators Journal*, January, 1971, p. 61.

Educational television began in the United States in 1953 when there was only one ETV station. With the rapid growth of the number of stations there has been concomitant growth of music programs. By 1961 Richard Berg estimated that there were approximately 100,000 students receiving instruction in music from a single series of broadcasts emanating from New York City. In 1963 Lawrence McKune tabulated 18,254 music lessons which he reported had either been completely televised or else used in a series of lessons in some one of the supplemental techniques.[107]

> An analysis indicated that music courses had been presented over ninety-two ETV systems in thirty states. Music ranked fourth in total number of complete courses taught.[108]

Much of the most recent study and analysis of the utilization of instructional television for education in music has been done by Thomas H. Carpenter. In 1971 he reported that there was a rapidly increasing number of locales and that on the elementary level, televised music instruction "is evolving toward programming that is both valid in content and sophisticated in production."[109] He based this judgment as well as other observations and opinions on two national surveys that were conducted between 1964 and 1969. Carpenter completed the second survey under a research grant from the United States Office of Education; this survey included observation and interviews in 17 widely separated television centers in the nation.[110] Carpenter has recently completed a book on televised music instruction; it is scheduled for publication by the MENC in the very near future. In a letter to this investigator accompanying a copy of the third chapter of his book, he writes:

---

[106] Robert A. Choate, "Research in Music Education," Journal of Research in Music Education, Volume XIII, No. 2, Summer, 1965, p. 81.

[107] Thomas H. Carpenter, op. cit.

[108] Thomas H. Carpenter, op. cit.

> I have also enclosed a copy of a section of the book that I have written for the MENC; it contains the trends of televised music instruction as I see them. I give you permission to paraphrase any of the information that is included.[111]

The dominant trends that Carpenter reports include the improvement of studio and production techniques, changes in attitudes of the music educators, changes in the modes of presentation, as well as changes in the structure of the musical materials. With regard to studio and production techniques, music educators at the 1972 MENC Biennial (after viewing 22 selected music telelessons) agreed that television teachers and their studio crews had made great progress. Opinion at the media conference was, however, that music teachers were not falling prey to gadgetry, either visual or auditory. Yet they did recognize that the TV lesson sometimes needs varying levels of motivation, that production can be sophisticated and still maintain integrity, and that the possibility exists that present studio technology could be utilized even more for music education. The educators did not agree on what constituted a valid, effective program of musical learning, but they were in agreement on the basic purpose of music education as the development of musicality.

---

[109] Thomas H. Carpenter, op. cit.

[110] Thomas H. Carpenter, "The Utilization of Instructional Television in Music Education," United States Office of Education, USOE Project No. 5-8306; ED 032 788; (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968).

[111] Thomas H. Carpenter, letter to the investigator, dated October 17, 1972.

Regarding the direction of change in the modes of presentation in television, there seems to be a definite move from teacher-classroom situations to anything but teacher and classroom. (Use a treehouse, a music store, or a big rock, but never a classroom; use a passerby, puppets, or exaggerated animals, but never a teacher or a student.) The music teacher sitting at the piano for 15 or 20 minutes is a thing of the past; so is the lecturer at the chalkboard or the flannel board. Since it is now accepted that TV is not the best place for drill or practice sessions, the present TV lesson needs even more cooperation from the teacher for pre-practice and post-practice sessions. This means that the regular classroom teacher or the music specialist must now become a more vital part of the music lesson on TV; most districts have developed TV committees from the teacher ranks for assistance on this and other TV problems. The TV lesson can no longer be the responsibility of the director (music) and the producer (TV) only; it must now be a combined effort. Frequently it is presented as a team teaching situation and music teaching "aids" have become a part of production.

The lessons themselves now place less emphasis on music reading through learning tonal and rhythmic patterns and more emphasis on the Orff approaches and Kodály techniques. More and more acceptable also is the idea that educational TV can be educational and entertaining at the same time.

Much has been learned from "Sesame Street" and "Electric Company":

1. Sometimes short, individual sessions can best cover a concept; all sessions need not be a part of a planned sequence.
2. Whenever it does not interfere with lesson objectives, humor can be interjected.
3. The pace of the music lesson is as important as the visual interest.
4. Less authoritative figures can often get the message across best: puppets, guests, the cameraman, etc.[112]

Although there are many new developments in music education via television, and many highly individualized programs in different areas of the United States, one knotty problem remains constant--that of evaluation. Many kinds of success indicators have been used: quizzes administered by the classroom teacher, feedback sheets, personal interaction between the classroom teacher and the TV teacher or director, grade level meetings that provide collective reactions, and suggestion sheets for future planning. The problem of evaluation still remains a very difficult one. So many concerns, other than the simple mechanics of discovering what has been learned, are involved in evaluation. Clearly, consideration must be given to the clarity of the objectives, the effectiveness of the visuals, the adequacy of the directions and the explanations, the amounts of materials being presented, the number of concepts in the lesson, the class members' attitudes, the possibility of poor reception in some cases, and the effectiveness of the TV guides. Some teachers involved with educational TV doubt that much of the information given in the TV guide is being used effectively by the classroom teachers. The guides themselves present problems: though not as comprehensive as they once were, they still control the TV lesson; once printed and distributed, there can be no deviation from the plan. Yet despite the many problems and the sometime questionable success of music instruction through television, the number of programs continues to increase, and the quality of the programs is still improving. One thing is certain, however: the future of music instruction via television will not emerge as a replacement of the music instruction in the classroom, but rather it will be a vital companion and important complement to regular classroom instruction.

---

[112] Thomas H. Carpenter, letter to the investigator (paraphrased), October 17, 1972.

There are a number of other interesting innovative programs functioning in various school districts in the United States. (If one defines innovative as simply new to that district, then all innovative programs are too numerous to include. True innovativeness becomes questionable.) The programs that have been discussed are simply a few that seem to be the most popular today. Renewed interest in the Dalcroze method is worthy of mention, and programmed approaches are also innovative in the same sense as being new ideas today. A number of programmed developments are being sponsored in the nation's public schools. These have become most effective where the stress is on the individuality of the child and also where the open classroom prevails. This study will not report the programmed approaches nor the many uses of other media for elementary music instruction because these programs are not yet fully developed on the elementary level.

Summary

The pendulum of trend in elementary music education seemed to be swinging in the direction of support for music on the elementary level as taught by the regular classroom teacher until three major developments turned the tide of support and started the pendulum in the opposite direction. These were: (1) the Yale Seminar; (2) the MENC-, corporation-, or federally-funded music projects; and (3) the Tanglewood Symposium. Even the MENC finally decided to support its own commission recommendation favoring a special music teacher for the elementary classroom music.

Many innovative programs were introduced to elementary music education, some from other lands and some from the United States. Of these, the most frequently reported have been the programs of Orff, Kodály, and Suzuki; CMP; MMCP; YMC; CEMREL; JRL; and the Hawaii Curriculum Project. With so many innovative programs claiming success and with both programmed learning and TV approaches on the increase, it would seem that music education might be flourishing on the elementary level in the U. S. This survey was dedicated to an investigation of that idea.

CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

For the most part it is not the specialist in music who is making the decisions today regarding the philosophy and the direction for elementary music education in the public schools of the nation. Although the most qualified to guide its direction, the specialist in music plays a relatively minor role compared to the decision-making roles of the local board, the superintendent, the principal, and the classroom teacher. Furthermore, although the specialist in music is the best prepared to understand and realize the potential for musical learning and the development of musical skills, it is the general classroom teacher who is most frequently assigned to teach elementary classroom music.

What, then, _is_ the concern of the music specialist today? What are these specialists in music education writing about, thinking about, talking about--in conventions and conferences and in their professional journals, books, monographs, essays, speeches, etc.? A review of the concerns of music educators as seen through a study of professional journals, publications, and university courses of study for music education (from early 1970 to June, 1972) is appropriate to this study. Furthermore, since the related recent work of educators, psychologists, and philosophers in music is of prime importance to the development of elementary music education, a brief review of contemporary thinking and research findings important to elementary music education are also appropriate to this study.

Music Education

By and large music educators are very gregarious and very vocal people. Over 60,000 of them across the nation are members of the Music Educators National Conference. The official voice of this organization is a journal issued to the members of the conference nine times a year. The Music Educators Journal and related publications of the national association (Journal of Research in Music Education; CMP Newsletter; Music Power, formerly Up Beat; and many monographs and books on music education) are by far the most widespread expression of this group of educators. It is doubtful whether or not these publications are representative of the attitudes of music educators around the country, i.e., from those working in a district composed of only one school through those in districts composed of more than 200 elementary schools. (This was a prime reason for inquiry into the relationship between the size of the district and the many facets of the present music program.) Music Educators Journal believes itself to be a very serious, deeply concerned, articulate periodical which attempts to reflect the problems, the thinking, and the direction of music education in the United States. Since its reader audience is reportedly over 200,000, it is important to know "who" reads the Journal and "what kinds" of material appear therein in order to relate such information to actual practices of teaching music in elementary schools.

The results of a readership survey were reported in the May, 1970, issue of Music Educators Journal. The survey itself was compiled by the National Education Association, based on a random sampling (2,000) which drew a 65% return.

Who reads the Music Educators Journal?

1. The age of the readers:

Under 30	51%
30-39	20%
40-49	15%
50 and over	14%

2. Level of instruction of the readers:

Elementary	24%
Jr. High	16%
Sr. High	40%
Jr. College; College; University	18%
Other	2%

3. The specific musical involvement of the readers:

Instrument or applied	37%
General and choral	47%
Administrative and supervisory	9%
Teacher education	4%
Theory, history, literature, humanities	2%
Other	1%

4. The geographic area of the readers:

Urban or suburban schools	78%
Rural schools	22%

5. Age related to urban areas:

Under 30	66+% urban or suburban
Over 50	83% urban or suburban

Futher, it was reported that almost 20% of the readers read no other music magazine regularly, and that the Music Educators Journal has a "readership" of three persons per copy. At that reporting date (May, 1970), the circulation was 69,000; this meant that the reader audience exceeded 207,000 readers exclusive of those who read the Journal in the libraries. Without question, the Music Educators Journal is the single, most vocal expression of music educators across the nation. This does not necessarily mean, however, that it is a truly representative or critical voice.

In attempting to answer questions related to "what" the elementary music educator is concerned with as reflected in the Music Educators Journal, it became important to list, classify, and organize recent articles (those which appeared in the 23 issues of the Music Educators Journal from January, 1970, through May, 1972); an earlier chronological survey such as this one covered an analysis content from 1957 until 1967.[113] With a great deal of overlapping (where articles could be classified under several headings) it was found that there were at least 50 subjects related to elementary music education or of interest to elementary music educators published during that period. The 50 subjects covered about 450 articles. Below is a list of the subjects about which articles were written for Music Educators Journal from January, 1970, through May, 1972. Since some articles could obviously be listed under several headings the number of articles concerning the subject that are recorded here represents only a general figure for comparison.

Number of Articles	General Subject
8	Administration and supervision
11	Aesthetics, feelings, emotions in music
2	Affective behavior and music
1	American Indian music (specifically); also under Ethnic music
8	Appreciation of music (including literature for elementary, listening, etc.)
2	Aptitude in music
16	The Arts; Related arts; Humanities; etc.
3	Assessment (national); Testing projects
10	Audiences, including building new audiences, etc.
7	Behavioral objectives, including research on musical behavior, etc.
9	Buildings, rooms, equipment, etc.
5	Catalogues (elementary choruses, etc.)

---

[113] Maureen Dorothea Hooper, "Major Concerns of Music Education: Content Analysis of the Music Educators Journal, 1957-1967." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Ed. D., University of Southern California, 1969.

Number of Articles	General Subject
5	Change and the need for change in elementary music education
3	Classroom teachers (Task Group IV, MENC, included)
7	Community support, public relations, etc.
3	Comprehensive musicianship (elementary)
5	Concepts--in elementary music education, including learning theories, etc.
20+	Creativity, including the relationship to "knowing," etc.
30+	Course content, courses of study, curriculum, etc. (much overlap here)
5	Disadvantaged
1	Discovery as a music concept
35	Elementary school music ("how" concepts as applied to methods, etc.)
16	Ethnic music, Afro-American music, etc.
1	Evaluation (national assessment)
2	Gifted children, also under Special education
28	Handicapped; Exceptional children, etc. (entire issue April, 1972)
20	Innovational, including Task Group III, MENC, reports and interviews
5	Instrumental training
1	Kodály (referred to in many other articles)
1	Language and music
26	Learning theory, concept and perception, implications of Piaget, etc.
1	Legislation and the arts
1	Library
7	Listening
3	Meaning in music, McLuhan, etc.
26	Mass media in education
1	Mexican-American problems, also under Ethnic music
7	Objectives and goals, including the MENC "GO" report, etc.
2	Orff (referred to in other articles)
3	Performance in elementary
1	Principles of teaching elementary music education
3	Programmed instruction on the elementary level
2	Student training, also included in Teacher training
5	Suzuki (also mentioned in other articles)
3	Teaching strings--elementary
3	Teacher techniques, elementary
26	Teacher training, including report of the MENC Task Group IV, etc.
22	Technology and music teaching (entire issue January, 1971)
37+	Urban education (entire issue January 1970, and reissued as a separate magazine)
7	Youth music in elementary

Even the most superficial consideration of the list of subjects about which the various articles in Music Educators Journal have been written during the past two-and-a-half years reveals a few very obvious factors:

1. Several subjects are considered of such importance that entire sections, issues, or reissues are devoted to them:
   "Facing the Music in Urban Education," January, 1970.
   "Technology in Music Teaching," January, 1971.
   "Music in Special Education," April, 1972.
   "Music in World Cultures," October, 1972.
2. Some subjects keep returning intermittently although their appearance is infrequent:
   Implications of Piaget
   Learning Theories
   Behavioral Objectives
3. The subject matter of the discussions and conference sessions is very closely related to the subject matter about which many articles are written:
   Objectives for Music Education
   "GO" Project
   Ethnic Music
   Youth Music
   Pre-Service and In-Service Teacher Education

In other words, the leadership of the Music Educators National Conference speaks through the editorial board of its official magazine, Music Educators Journal, and the magazine reflects almost entirely the interests of the leadership. An example of this close relationship between association leadership and editorial selection of journal subjects is the MENC project "GO" (Goals and Objectives), initiated in the fall of 1969. It was designed to be a truly representative voice of the association, and 1,000 members were involved in charting the future course of the conference. There were 18 national committees, with a national chairman for each, and representatives of each of the six MENC divisions as well as the 50 states. The basic purpose of the project (one of the most important in all MENC history) was to identify the organization's responsibilities in an endeavor to confront today's problems with decisive action and to "make a realistic assessment of its membership's talents, competencies, skills, and overall potentialities." The committee titles are almost identical with Journal subjects. The main concerns were: teacher competencies, urban problems, ethnic music, youth music, electronic music, instructional technology, and aesthetic education.

A few detailed examples of this exceedingly close relationship between the MENC leadership and Music Educators Journal subject matter can be cited. The Journal itself, during the past two-and-a-half years, has treated several of these subjects to nearly complete issues, or at least to special coverage. Among the most outstanding were the following:

1. January, 1970: "Facing the Music in Urban Education." This subject was the prime critical issue of the Tanglewood Symposium (summer, 1967). It had very special treatment in the Journal and was reissued as a special study alone. Its message was clear:

> Across the United States, in every city, an educational revolution is underway. The front lines are the ghetto schools. Command headquarters is the administration office. The combat troops are principals, school board members, parents, students, politicians, and teachers--among them music educators. The issue is not simply whether to change, but how much change, what kind, and how fast.... As the tug of war strikes the curriculum, the losses and gains will not only affect every subject, but the future of music in the nation.... Awareness breeds good decisions ... vision in the present crisis is crucial ... wisdom paramount.[114]

If reader comment is any indication of success, the results of this issue were very positive. As expressed by readers in later issues, there was much enthusiasm for the exposure as well as suggested resolutions to the many problems involved.

2. October, 1970:

A special report on teacher education in music dominated the issue. A critical question--and one that is of prime import to the present study--came in for some debate in the latter report. (The issue of the special music teacher in elementary education will be discussed later in the reporting of results of the survey; the challenge voiced by the interim report of the MENC Task Groups I, II, III, and IV was to find ways of teaching teachers more effectively.) The question of effective teaching on the elementary level was answered in the form of a recommendation: that music in the elementary schools be taught by music specialists. However, the report stated that since this was not feasible for every school, each person planning to teach in elementary school should, therefore, receive preparation to handle music instruction. The MENC, in reporting the recommendation, made it clear that at _that_ time the commission position and the official position on the utilization of music specialists should not be confused. _The MENC had no firmly stated policy (at that time) on the preference for music specialists rather than elementary classroom generalists with special training in the elementary music education program._[115]

---

[114] "Facing the Music in Urban Education," Music Educators Journal, Volume 56, No. 5, January, 1970, p. 34.

3. December, 1970:

The "GO" project, as stated earlier, came in for special attention, and the MENC goals and objectives were clearly outlined. Meanwhile the staff of the _Music Educators Journal_ and the president of the MENC prepared a special issue that was designed to assist the teacher in preparing lessons on youth music and to answer the need recognized at the Tanglewood Symposium: that 80% of the students were _outside_ the music program in the schools. (The percentage is considerably higher now.)

4. January, 1971:

The issue was devoted almost entirely to technology in music teaching--to clarify and expand thinking concerning instructional technology. While it was not intended to be a complete guide to all media nor to specific application of every medium available, it did cover a large cross-section of the field. Further, it contained a valuable glossary of technological terms with which most readers might not have been acquainted. Ideas of merits and demerits of instructional technology were freely expressed. The most important factor in the issue was the cry for awareness on the part of the music teacher that education in the American school could not succeed unless it was designed to meet the changing needs of the students and the society it served. This special issue was also printed as a separate monograph.

---

[115] In July, 1972, MENC's national executive board adopted an official position: "Satisfactory instructional leadership can best be provided by specialists."

5. October, 1972:

   This issue was devoted entirely to music in world cultures. Tear-out sound sheets and detailed information regarding the enclosed recordings were included. Because the terminology encountered (in studies of ethnic musics) involves so many languages, a glossary of terms was also provided. Chant, pronunciation, choreography, pictures, and the actual music contributed to many articles. Most important were the discussions of the significance of world musics in American schools. Both challenge and dangers of inclusion in the curriculum were presented.

The topics covered in the five issues of Music Educators Journal cited above are evidently of concern to the MENC, and some readers express gratitude for the special coverage ("Readers Comment"). A few readers, however, feel the MENC is neglecting their needs:

> This will be the first year since I began teaching that I will not join MENC.... I have become thoroughly disgusted with the Journal and the role of MENC; I find little or nothing helpful to my teaching situation. The Journal has gone "downhill" and does not serve the majority of music educators.[116]

> It is understandable to me why [reader #1] is outraged at the quality of classroom music instruction and requests the attention of the MENC to the situation ... the "self-contained classroom" ... has resulted in disaster for music education on the elementary level.[117]

A second periodical, Journal of Research in Music Education, is usually published quarterly by the MENC. During the period covered by this study (January, 1970, through May, 1972), a few articles of special interest to music education on the elementary level appeared in nearly every issue. The subject matter of these articles again points the path of interest and inquiry on the part of the professionals in elementary music education. For the most part, they were articles on research related to:

1. learning musical concepts
2. developing skills in music, i.e., music reading, performance on instruments, ear training, creative thinking, etc.
3. role of aptitude in music; intelligence and academic achievement
4. musical achievement and the self-concept
5. programmed learning in music (such as that for listening skills, music reading, rhythm skills, beginning instruments, woodwind skills, etc.)

---

[116] Ira L. Walker, Jr., (Readers Comment), Music Educators Journal, November, 1970, p. 3.

[117] Sanford M. Helm, (Readers Comment), Music Educators Journal, September, 1971, p. 9.

6. attitudes (the classroom teacher and the music specialist, for example)
7. young audiences

The voice of some music educators is most explicitly heard in the various publications of the MENC; there are, however, other singular voices that do express themselves and are influential in music education.

It was the famed composer and conductor Leonard Bernstein who pointed out about ten years ago that, for the first time in history, children were creating music without the assistance of the adults, without training from the teachers; and, as a matter of fact, the adults were peeping enviously into the children's world. This was Leonard Bernstein on "the revolution of rock." In 1964 manufacturers turned out 15,000 Beatle wigs a day. English professors were painstakingly analyzing the Beatles' lyrics while musicians were busy analyzing their music; someone in the press compared the Beatles to Schubert, and someone else called "Sgt. Pepper" a work of art. What influence did the "youth music" have on the music education of the '60s? At that time even elementary children were beginning to test their music teachers' familiarity with youth music. But the teachers were busy with concept-centered teaching; with spiral learning; with the discovery method; with possible grants from Title I and Title III government appropriations; and with innovational programs concerned mostly with subject matter. Their conferences and sessions were dominated by the techniques, methods, and approaches of Orff, Kodály, and Suzuki, and by the thinking (a few reported) of such research psychologists as Bruner, Piaget, etc. The student who was not "turned on" by the teacher's music was simply lost to music education.

The interest of music educators is not only reflected in publications and heard in the expressions of famous musicians; it can be seen easily in the courses offered at the universities and colleges. Summer brush-up courses as well as conferences in which teachers participate also reflect the interests of music teachers and music educators. It is of interest to this study to present a cursory survey of classes offered to music educators during the last three summers in reflection--to some extent--of the issues of the '70s.

Below are the subjects listed for the summers of 1970, 1971, and 1972 (elementary music subjects only), as advertised in professional music journals by a number of universities, schools of music, and conservatories:

Subject	1970	1971	1972
Suzuki	Ithaca College Manhattan School of Music Matsumoto	University of Idaho DePaul University Matsumoto	University of Tennessee Manhattan School of Music Matsumoto
Orff-Schulwerk	Berkshire Country Day School DePaul University Peabody Institute Westminster College Manhattan School of Music Eastman School of Music Ball State University	Hartt DePaul University Chicago Music College Westminster College Memphis State Royal Conservatory, Toronto Ball State University	Berkshire Country Day School DePaul University Temple University Westminster (introductory and advanced) State University College (Fredonia) University of Massachusetts Newark State College Fairleigh Dickinson University Ball State University
Kodály	Kodály Music Training Institute Peabody Institute Manhattan School of Music Westminster College Northwestern University University of Mississippi University of Evansville Eastman School of Music	Kodály Music Training Institute Hartt Westminster College State University College (Fredonia) University of Bridgeport Royal Conservatory, Toronto	Kodály Music Training Institute Hartt Westminster (introductory and advanced) State University College (Fredonia) Holy Names College University of Mississippi Newark State College Temple University Duquesne University Fairleigh Dickinson University
Orff-Kodály	Southern Methodist University	Ithaca College	Minot State College Manhattan School of Music Eastman School of Music

Subject	1970	1971	1972
Kodály-Richards	Holy Names College	----	----
Manhattanville Music Curricula	Ithaca College	Eastman School of Music Oakland University Northwestern University	Eastman School of Music University of Massachusetts University of Wisconsin Northwestern University
Elementary Music Education	Peabody Institute Chicago Music College American University	New York University University of Idaho Southern Methodist University University of Windsor	University of Denver Temple University Newark State College
Trends, Objectives	----	New York University	Mount Mary College
Classroom Guitar	Hartt Ithaca College Westminster College	Hartt Ithaca College Southern Methodist University	Hartt University of Denver Teachers College, Columbia Westminster College New England Conservatory Fairleigh Dickinson University
Electronic Music	Peabody Institute Westminster College	Berklee School of Music Westminster College State University College (Fredonia) University of Bridgeport Northwestern University Royal Conservatory, Toronto	Temple University Hartt State University College (Fredonia) Teachers College, Columbia
Media	Peabody Institute	State University College (Fredonia) Ohio State University	----

Subject	1970	1971	1972
Dalcroze	Dalcroze International School of Music Eastman School of Music Cleveland Institute of Music	Dalcroze International School of Music Ithaca College Cleveland Institute of Music	Dalcroze International School of Music University of North Carolina University of Wisconsin Cleveland Institute of Music
Computer-Generated Music	----	Stanford University Northwestern University	----
Instrumental Methods	University of Evansville	Mankato State College	----
Handicapped: Special Education	State University Pottsdam	----	University of Denver Duquesne University
Classroom Instruments	Fresno State	State University College (Fredonia)	----
Creative Processes	----	Temple University	----
Ethnic Studies	----	State University College (Fredonia) Northwestern University Arizona	University of Denver Westminster College Mills College Ithaca College
Comprehensive Musicianship	Westminster College	Southern Methodist University Northwestern University	University of Denver Temple University
Interrelated Arts	Westminster College	State University College (Fredonia)	University of Denver Temple University Georgetown University University of Michigan

Subject	1970	1971	1972
Music-Theatre	----	----	Hartt Manhattan School of Music Teachers College, Columbia Westminster College University of Wisconsin Temple University
Recorder Workshops	----	----	Hartt Westminster College Mount Mary College
Handbell Workshops	----	----	Westminster
Jazz in the Classroom	----	----	University of Maryland State University College (Fredonia) Eastman School of Music Berklee School of Music Fairleigh Dickinson University
Humanities Approach to Music Education	Westminster College	----	Westminster College Georgetown University Indiana State University

It is very interesting to note that, despite the superficial nature of the preceding account, there still is evidence of great interest in some of the "innovational" ideas of the '60s. A few new interests have been discovered, however, and are thereby added to the list of courses offered for summer students. The schools and summer sessions advertised in Music Educators Journal from January, 1970, through May, 1972, do not, by any means, represent all the universities or colleges offering summer session subjects of interest to elementary teachers; nor does this list, by any means, include the entire course offerings of the schools that are listed. The last four named subjects in the advertisements--which seem new--are offered for both the elementary and the secondary teachers. One might conclude that even such a cursory list does indicate continued interest in the Orff approach, the Kodály method, and the Suzuki theories; it also definitely shows interest in newer curriculum designs, such as MMCP and CMP; in ethnic studies; in interrelated arts; as well as an increase in classroom guitar and the earlier Dalcroze methods and ideas;[118] an interest in newer subjects now being approached in the elementary schools, i.e., music-theatre, jazz, a humanities approach, etc. It does not, however, show any special courses designed to provide the music teacher in elementary schools with greater comprehension of the explorations of contemporary psychologists in relation to music education, of the behavioral points of view as related to music education, or any of the new research results of the '70s and their possible relationship to learning music in the elementary levels. What it does show, in a very slight way, is "what" those music educators responsible for the education of the teachers in music feel that the teachers need or will be interested in for their further training. It does reflect the thinking of those responsible for teacher training in elementary music education. (It may also reflect interest in "selling" courses that will get enrollment.)

---

[118] Dalcroze Eurhythmics is now taught at many institutions. One, the Cleveland Institute of Music, now offers a bachelor of music degree with a major in eurhythmics.

Summarizing the music educators' interests as reflected in recent publications of the national organization, it would seem that the most important concerns of the '70s to the MENC are:

1. the socio-economic problems as they relate to music
2. new techniques, methods, curricula, and materials
3. behavioral objectives and musical behavior
4. community support

All of these trends of interest are a part of the contemporary elementary music education scene, but a real analysis of potential direction and ways of achieving desired goals does not seem to exist. There is no word on the true status of elementary music education. If elementary music education in the public schools of the United States is suffering from any disorganization, disagreement regarding goals or philosophy, or an unsympathetic climate for improving the situation, the MENC is seemingly uninvolved or noncommitted, suggesting a mode of conservatism.

Besides MENC publications there are in music education today many new works written for the elementary music teacher. Few are of the scope or depth of the early works of James L. Mursell (some of whose works are today being reissued), who did not try to lay out a framework of subject matter but gave us a broad philosophical base for planning.[119] Many of the recent works and reissues of old works, such as Nye and Nye,[120] deal mostly with the specific subject matter of music. There may be brief sections on what constitutes a good learning environment for children, or on how children grow and learn, but, by and large, the books deal with the details of the subject matter of early music instruction.

Another area of elementary music publication has been the production of pamphlets, guides, and frameworks dealing specifically with the elementary music curriculum; these have usually been written by music educators and printed or published by cities or state boards of education for their local districts. The Iowa City Community School District, for example, has published its own curriculum and resource guide for elementary general music;[121] the State Department of Education of South Carolina has published its own elementary music curriculum for grades K-6;[122] and, as mentioned earlier, the California State Department of Education has published its Music Framework (K-12) recently.[123] All of these manuals are directed to the elementary music teacher; all emphasize the importance of music education, the purpose of music education, and expectancies in music education for elementary school pupils. A few of these say that their purpose is to meet the needs of each child, but they do not carry out this purpose in the organization of their materials. Most today are based on "concept," "taxonomy," "spiral learning," "behavioral objectives," or a combination of these ideas.

---

[119] James L. Mursell, op. cit.

[120] Robert E. Nye and Vernice T. Nye, Music in the Elementary School, (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957).

[121] Iowa City Community School District, Elementary General Music: Curriculum Guide & Resource Guide, 1971.

[122] State Department of Education, Columbia, South Carolina, Planning Elementary Music Curriculum, Grades K-6, 1969.

[123] California State Board of Education, Music Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve, 1971.

Educational Psychology

Many educators and psychologists today seem to be riding one or the other of two sets of tracks: one set emanates from the Freudian camp, stresses learning from the "inside out," and starts with the child and an understanding of his needs, motivations, and behaviors; the other set, from the Piaget camp, stresses learning from the "outside in," and hopes to further the development of civilization and man's society by finding the best ways to pass on to its progeny necessary skills and knowledge. But great changes in society have caused commensurate changes in ideas and concepts of education. This can be seen easily in the changes in the very meaning of the word "education." It is a far cry back to 1930 when newly-built Royce Hall at UCLA emblazoned educator Ernest Carroll Moore's definition of education above its proscenium arch: "Education is the mastery of the tools which the race has found indispensable." Educators and psychologists have continuously pursued the meaning of education, the values of education, and the ways in which education can serve best the interests of man as an individual and as a member of society. To explore this area of thinking, psychologists and educators have still mainly pursued their research along one or the other of the two tracks. Some research seems to be directed into both avenues, both points of view.

One of the most respected psychologists and writers in this area of investigation is Jerome S. Bruner, director of the Center for Cognitive Studies at Harvard University. Bruner's creative explorations and experiments in the area of learning have fired the imagination of a large group of educators in the nation. He is as frequently misquoted as quoted, more frequently misunderstood than understood. A few of his theories have become catchwords, and many music educators have jumped on the bandwagon of "concept learning," "spiral learning," "creativity," etc. Bruner himself pays homage to both Piaget and Vygotsky:

> Piaget has given us a respectful sense of the manner in which an intrinsic and self-contained logic characterizes mental operations at any stage of development, however primitive it may be. Vygotsky has given us a vision of the role of internalized dialogue as the basis of thought, a guarantor of social patterning in that most lonely sphere, the exercise of mind.[124]

By the late '60s Bruner contended that the "lock step" of "learning theory" had been broken in this country though it was still the standard village dance. More recently published, a Bruner book includes a large collection of his essays written during the disturbing, tumultuous years between 1964 and 1970 (the Berkeley Free Speech Movement, political activities at colleges across the nation, etc.). Background for these essays were the themes of naturalness and spontaneity, direct encounter, distrust of traditional ways, anti-establishmentarianism, etc., and by 1970 Bruner was expressing the thought that education was in a state of crisis and had failed to respond to imperative changes in social needs, that education was lagging behind instead of leading. Bruner was by this time convinced that the educational system in the United States was, in effect, a way of maintaining a class system--a group at the bottom. When The Relevance of Education[125] was published, Bruner was searching for what he called social innovation, however radical, that would make it possible for people to work together on the massive problems of poverty, urban life, and learning and to discover how to use American technology effectively.

---

[124] Jerome S. Bruner, On Knowing, Essays for the Left Hand, (New York: Atheneum, 1967), p. 8.

Bruner's most recent experiments and explorations have been of great interest and importance to music educators. He has not only tested his theories concerning the mind of man and how he learns but has frequently used musical learning in his examples and developments of those theories. This is seen in the seventh essay of the same book, The Relevance of Education.[126] To paraphrase Bruner: The moment that we say that music should be taught not to spectators but to participants, that we should teach music rather than about music, then the musician must be brought into the process as curriculum maker along with the teacher. For the basic assumption is that music is not so much the "topic" as it is the mode of thought, an apparatus for processing knowledge about the language of sound rather than a collection of facts that can be gotten out of a handbook. In Bruner's approach, in his manner of reasoning, this writer sees a very close relationship to the theories of McLuhan, especially to McLuhan's thesis in Understanding Media.[127]

---

[125] Jerome S. Bruner, The Relevance of Education, (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1971).

[126] Ibid.

Bruner not only recognizes the curriculum revolution and the effort to start children younger (and more effectively, on the way to grasping the more powerful ideas embodied in the learning), but he sees in this activity a fresh approach to the perfectability of the intellect. He states that the perfecting of the intellect begins earlier than we had thought and develops continually from the outside in as well as growing from within.[128] So important have these changes in approach become to Bruner that he states openly that he is moved to concentrate now, in his research, on the very young. In this he gives much credit for his direction to the groundwork of Benjamin S. Bloom's careful and well-known work,[129] which states strongly:

> A very major proportion of the variance in adult intellectual achievement, measured by a variety of procedures, is already accounted for by the time the child reaches the usual school starting age of five. For another, there are enough studies to indicate ... that certain possible critical, emotional, linguistic, cognitive patterns associated with social background are already present by the age of three.

Music educators have most assuredly taken the work of Bloom seriously when it comes to his study of educational objectives. They are not about to be left behind when new ideas, such as those developed by Bloom and his associates in taxonomy,[130] attempt to analyze and classify educational goals. A rapid rush of articles by music educators followed the organization of goals into three domains: cognitive, affective, and psychomotor. But where is the movement to study, understand, and organize our thinking in terms of musical learning in very early childhood based on the same research? Bruner saw the significance and changed his direction of exploration; contemporary music educators are still not studying in depth the subject of the affective domain and are equally involved with the other two domains--unfortunately, with unstudied haste. Touching only the peripheral lines of these new ideas does little to solve existing elementary music education problems. Further, if the elementary music educator is to understand "why" he is doing "what" he is doing, then needed most are those in-depth studies that will identify and clearly define the affective objectives in music education and those learning experiences that lead to the fulfillment of these objectives.

---

[127] Marshall McLuhan, Understanding Media, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964).

[128] Bruner, op. cit.

[129] Benjamin S. Bloom, David R. Krathwohl, and Bertram S. Masia, The Classification of Educational Goals, Handbook II: Affective Domain, (New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1964).

In his text Bloom stressed the fact that the affective domain was much more difficult to structure than the other domains and that he was much less satisfied with the results of the former. He expressed the hope that the work would facilitate research and thinking on the problems encountered in the affective domain.[131]

> Educational objectives in this domain tend to be statements of desirable but undefined virtues. As long as the affective objectives remain in this empty and airy limbo, there is little

---

[130] Ibid.

[131] Ibid., p. vii.

> that is likely to be done in the school either in evaluation or in the providing of appropriate learning experiences.[132]

Of all the concerns of music education the affective domain remains the most important. Unfortunately, it is the least understood and the most infrequently researched.

Of great importance to music education are also the many recently published works by a large variety of psychologists in the area of "contemporary issues in educational psychology" and "psychological concepts in education." Most of these recent publications are compilations of excellent articles by specialists. The views of both the geneticists and the environmentalists are reported to enable us to understand more fully the implications of the old nature-nurture conflict that is still with us; the views of the Piaget followers, the Bruner followers, and the Anderson followers are needed to answer many questions regarding cognitive development. (Can it be accelerated? To what extent are the optimistic views supported?)[133]

Most of the issues being dealt with today by psychologists in education are of prime importance to the development of elementary music education; very few of them are being explored by music educators. (In the February, 1971, issue of Music Educators Journal, this subject was touched lightly in a section titled "Involving the Young Child in Music.") The divergent views on "early reading," on "adolescence," on "stability of behavior," on "learning and cognition," on "measurement and evaluation"

---

[132] Ibid., p. 76.

[133] Harvey F. Clarizio, et al, Contemporary Issues in Educational Psychology, (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970).

(especially where it concerns individual differences), on "computer technology and individual instruction," on the "culturally disadvantaged child," on "classroom dynamics and mental health," and on a large number of equally important areas of learning--all bear on a better understanding of how the young child learns music. Yet most of them still stand in need of further in-depth research in music education. Briefly stated, the psychologist in music has explored only a very narrow area of learning in music.

Very little in music learning has touched the work or research of Lawrence S. Kubie, who recently retired as Clinical Professor of Psychiatry and Mental Health of Yale University; music educators seem unaware of the implications of this Freudian psychiatrist, whose research is popularly known as "education in depth" or from the "inside out." Yet Kubie's findings are relevant to early music education. Kubie strongly rejects the assumption that man can understand the world that lies outside himself without concurrently understanding himself. To him, self-knowledge is the forgotten man of the entire educational system in the United States and indeed of all human culture in general.[134] Kubie would have the music educator first concern himself with the child and that child's ability to understand (on different levels) himself, his own responses, his own abilities as they develop, and his own interests as they change in music. To paraphrase Kubie: The child who understands his own feelings, i.e., knows himself, is more strongly motivated than the child who must be motivated by artificial exterior sources. This child who knows his own interests and responses develops a predetermined awareness and appreciation of the effects of achieving educational goals. This is certain to have a positive "snowball" effect on the child's total education, particularly in those areas which enhance his aesthetic sensitivity.

---

[134] Lawrence S. Kubie, "The Forgotten Man of Education," Contemporary Educational Psychology, edited by Richard M. Jones, (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), p. 63.

To note all of the writers who have been dealing most recently with subjects of great import to early music education would be both impossible and completely out of the scope of this study. But to neglect a few very important works that have had a strong impact on education recently (and should have influenced the course of developments in music education) would also deny necessary perspective to the scope of this study. In this regard the work of Charles E. Silberman, formerly of Columbia University, is of great importance to early childhood music education. Crisis in the Classroom[135] is the result of a three-and-a-half-year study commissioned by the Carnegie Corporation of New York and is a clear indictment of current practices in the American public schools, whose critical problems Silberman not only examines with intensity, intelligence, and genuine honesty, but also attempts to solve with imaginative recommendations for complete educational overhaul from the lowest to the highest levels. Silberman has challenged education first to provide teachers with a sense of "purpose" or a philosophy of education (education for what?) and then to train the teachers so that they will acquire those qualities of mind and behavior that will assist them in nurturing in the young creativity and individuality. In programs that have been carrying out some of these goals, Silberman reports a change not only in teacher education and childhood development, but even in the formerly hostile or indifferent attitudes of the principal. Silberman cites only two states, North Dakota and Vermont, as presently being engaged in a complete reordering of their public schools. Music in these plans is completely different from the traditional elementary presentation, but awareness by the general music educator across the nation is yet forthcoming.

---

[135] Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom, (New York: Random House, 1970).

Like Dewey, Silberman reminds us that the school has the power to modify the social order, and that education is primarily a public business and only secondarily a specialized vocation. Silberman therefore addresses his "remaking of American education" to educator and layman alike, and says that if we are to prepare children to face today's technological problems and life effectively as adults, then they must be allowed to live fully and naturally as children, and our schools must be changed from repressive, stultifying institutions--with teachers who serve only as traffice managers, time controllers, policemen, etc.--to happy, joyful, unrepressive places where the child can develop fully every potential needed to face this complex society.

Educator John Holt also addressed himself to both the layman and the educator in his "best sellers" that in some colleges have become required reading. His is a telling diagnosis of the mind-crippling current educational methods; his urgent prescription for cure is very similar to the earlier views of Pestalozzi. They have attracted the attention of hundreds of thousands of people in his popular paperbacks How Children Learn[136] and How Children Fail.[137] John Holt stresses the natural learning style of young children: the child is curious, open, perceptive, receptive, experimental, bold, and patient. The child learns independently and out of interest and should have something to say about what and how he learns. There is great sympathy and understanding on the part of Holt for what A. S. Neill[138] is doing in England. Neill's radical approaches to child rearing and to education have been given much serious consideration by some of the most progressive educators in America today; in it, some of them see the only route to John Gardner's cry of the '60s for both equality and excellence as goals of American education. Gardner has been pointing out for two generations that we do not know what skills we will need in the future, but we do know that we must free learning from its shackles and give every individual the opportunity to develop his highest capacity for adjustment to changing circumstances and individual fulfillment.[139]

In this regard George B. Leonard, in his Education and Ecstasy,[140] not only repeats the challenge that the human brain has not begun to be explored to its potential, but further alerts us all to the power of ecstasy as education's most potent ally. Leonard's ecstasy is not opposed to reason and not necessarily opposed to order; it is the joy "of Handel proclaiming to his servant (after finishing the 'Hallelujah Chorus'): 'I did think I did see all Heaven before me, and the great God himself.'"[141] It is the motivation for learning described by Einstein: the pleasure of anticipating the pleasure of learning. Studying the nature of music, building an aesthetic basis for musical learning, could easily include Leonard's concept of ecstasy as a tool for education, as a means toward educational goals in music. In building a new educational structure based on the pleasures of learning, "motivation problems" would be minimized.

---

[136] John Holt, How Children Learn, op. cit.

[137] John Holt, How Children Fail, op. cit.

[138] A. S. Neill, Summerhill, (New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1960).

[139] John Gardner, Excellence, (New York: Harper & Row, 1971).

[140] George B. Leonard, Education and Ecstasy, (New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1968).

All the aforementioned contemporary educators, psychologists, and writers in education are in good company when they ask for serious thinking regarding the problems of schools and when they suggest ways to remedy the present crises. Even the great Albert Einstein was critical:

> It is in fact nothing short of a miracle that the modern methods of instruction have not yet entirely strangled the holy curiosity of inquiry.... It is a very grave mistake to think that the enjoyment of seeing and searching can be promoted by means of coercion and a sense of duty.[142]

The message to the elementary music educator from the contemporary thinker in education and psychology is clear: the schools must change to fit the nature of the child and the changing needs of society; the music educator must be prepared to do the same. This means that the elementary music educator must have a sense of purpose and a philosophy of education. As stated by Silberman, he must be trained in qualities needed to help develop two traits strikingly absent in young students: creative abilities and individuality. What music educators are doing is talking about creativity but doing little to foster it, talking about individuality and at the same time demanding conformity.

---

[141] Ibid., p. 232.

[142] Albert Einstein, quoted in George B. Leonard, op. cit., p. 233.

Psychology of Music

The tremendous impact of the prolific and innovative work of psychologist Carl E. Seashore on music educators of the '20s and early '30s ground to a halt with the severe criticism during the late '30s. His subject, psychology of music, may have had some minor predecessors in research but it came alive with the intensive work of Seashore and his coworkers at the University of Iowa in the 1920s. With few notable exceptions, however, it has nearly expired several times in the intervening years. The reasons for this are several:

1. Music educators found it very difficult to accept a dissection of music and an analysis and synthesis that treated music--their art--as if it were merely a laboratory science.
2. Music educators and professional musicians were suspicious of testing in music.
3. Music educators were not trained to administer the tests properly and were unable to evaluate and utilize the results properly.
4. Even when they did get results acceptable to a number of musicians and educators, there was no organized procedure or

plan for effectively utilizing the new knowledge.

5. Administrators in public schools were unwilling to allot time or money to statistical studies and evaluation of talents in a "frill" subject.

The great debate on evaluation of musical talent was staged in *Music Educators Journal*; the antagonist was the renowned psychologist in music education, James L. Mursell, and the protagonist and defender was Carl E. Seashore. In the October, 1937, issue of *Music Educators Journal*, Professor Mursell set forth his views, which differed radically from those of Seashore:

> There is only one satisfactory method of finding out whether the Seashore tests really measure musical ability; and that is to ascertain whether persons rating high or low or medium on these tests also rate high and low and medium in what one may call "musical behavior," i.e., sight singing, playing the piano, getting through courses of study in theory and applied music, and the like.[143]

In the December, 1937, issue of *Music Educators Journal*, Seashore was given space for rebuttal. He designated the Mursell theory as an "omnibus theory" and his own as the "theory of specifics" (giving as an analogy the relationship between a "cure-all" and a specific prescription in medicine). He defended his six measurements of musical talent, insisting:

1. They represent the theory of specific measurement insofar as they conform to the two universal scientific sanctions of isolation of factors and conclusions limited to factors

---

[143] Carl E. Seashore, *Psychology of Music*, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1938), Appendix, p. 383.

under control, etc.

2. They have been validated for what they purport to measure (careful revision and re-recording of the test factors to be forthcoming wherever there was low reliability).
3. Their application is strictly limited to the legitimate implications of the factors measured; they were not intended to be interpreted as averaging the various factors to get a musical average.

The Seashore tests suffered from popular and superficial advertising as well as from much misinterpretation. Here and there musicians in education explored the field and added to the literature on testing in music. A number of new tests appeared in the '40s and '50s and, more recently, new developments have brought renewed interest. But for awhile the tremendous surge of activity from the University of Iowa that resulted in experimentation and extensive publication of many areas of psychology of music (the evaluation of musical talent, for example) began to slow down, nearly disappearing.

Three important factors of Seashore's explorations and experimentations remain moot questions for the research student of the 1970s:

1. Is musical talent really unequivocally inherited? (There are still extremists supporting both sides of this coin.)
2. Is musicality positively a combination of many separate and sometimes unrelated aptitudes?
3. Are tests and measures in music still suspect?

A recent updated version by Paul S. Farnsworth of Stanford

University of his earlier book, The Social Psychology of Music,[144] picks up the thread of Seashore's work and attempts to bring a bit more balance into the picture of psychology of music by moving from the overstress of earlier works on the importance of the biological bases of musical behavior to a search of cultural determinants as possible explanations of some important factors of musical behavior. Farnsworth's reissue includes new research in music education, sociology, and psychology that he believes to be closely related to the problems of teaching music. He stresses the absence of musical absolutes and, as in the earlier version, places before the reader problems of common sense knowledge, the scientific attitude, and constraints in psychomusical research. He still is interested in accounting for the Western scales with all the possible implications, especially the sociological ones. He devotes a great deal of his discussion to concepts of melody and combinations of sounds, especially in terms of recent developments in electronics and stereo (particularly the need for understanding "location" in sound, etc.). Farnsworth also suggests, for example, that musical science would be improved if the traditional concept of consonance were dropped from the literature.

It is interesting to note that Farnsworth, basically a psychologist and not a musician, uses the word "ability" rather than capacity, talent, or aptitude; he feels that "ability" suggests the power to act but makes no implications about the relative contributions of nature and nurture.

---

[144] Paul R. Farnsworth, The Social Psychology of Music, (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1969).

His more recent volume is very valuable to the music educator if only in terms of its complete review of standardized tests and measurements in many areas of music. As a matter of fact, research in all areas of psychology of music are pertinent to the educator in music as teachers become more aware of areas of influence in music education from outside the school as well as inside. (Some universities are again adding psychology of music laboratories to their music programs; this trend had disappeared during the '50s and '60s.) Farnsworth's search for alternative hypotheses and his penetrating scrutiny of all published tests and measurements of musical ability are invaluable to the contemporary music educator. They are the bridge between the original Seashore material--the original hypotheses and premises--and the present inheritor of the Seashore mantle, Edwin Gordon, of the same university.[145] Gordon's work at the University of Iowa has resulted in an exceedingly well-accepted battery of new tests for the measurement of musical talent, the "MAT" (Musical Aptitude Tests), and has motivated new activities in the psychology of music as well. Further, he has made an extensive contribution to the music educator in elucidating the applications of current learning theories to learning in music. Available are a new multi-level musical achievement battery (the Iowa Tests of Musical Literacy) and a renewal of the monographs in psychology of music.

This writer attempted to check the interest of general classroom teachers and elementary music specialists in developments in psychology of music. On three separate occasions when the researcher was presenting music workshops to general elementary classroom teachers in three separate California districts in the spring of 1966, the following questions were asked of the teachers:

---

[145] Edwin Gordon, The Psychology of Music Teaching, (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971).

1. Do you use any tests of musical ability to serve your music teaching needs?
2. Are you familiar with recent work in psychology of music?
3. Would you care to have information regarding recent developments in psychology of music?

Not only were the answers to all three questions always negative; there was no enthusiasm or display of interest on the part of the teachers.

Music specialists at California music educators' conferences were also queried the same spring. Little interest or concern was found. The work in psychology of music seems to be little known to the average classroom teacher who frequently is the only one responsbile for music in the classroom of the elementary school. Further, it would seem that even the specialists in music do not have the same concerns in music education that are being expressed by psychologists in music, psychologists in education, or even educators in research. The reasons for this lack of mutual concern and interest seem varied:

1. Music specialists may be unaware of the value of the investigations to the pursuit of musical goals.
2. Music specialists may have neither the time nor the needed skill to administer and interpret the measurements in music.
3. Music specialists may not have confidence in the validity and

reliability of the measurements.

All of the papers of the International Seminar on Experimental Research in Music Education presented at the University of Reading (Reading, England) in 1968 were published in the Spring, 1969, issue of the Journal of Research in Music Education. Paul R. Lehman, in "The Predictive Measurement of Musical Success," reported the situation at that time:

> The most striking development in the measurement of musical aptitude in recent years has been the sharp and persistent decline in interest in the topic in the United States. There are exceptions, of course, but in many quarters, this decline is now almost complete. The reduced status of aptitude testing in music at present is particularly noteworthy because it stands in such marked contrast to the intense activity of earlier decades of this century, beginning with the publication of Carl Seashore's test battery in 1919.
>
> As evidence of this decline, I can report the publication of only two new standardized tests in the English language in the last ten years, one in the United States and one in the United Kingdom.[146]

By winter of 1969 Lehman was writing a bit differently when he developed his "Selected Bibliography of Works on Music Testing":

> Although interest in music testing has increased substantially within the past few years, there is no adequate current bibliography of references on the topic. The sizable body of relevant literature, which represents the efforts of some of our most distinguished colleagues of past and present, provides a valuable insight into many of the central issues. While offering no final solutions, these contributions collectively reveal the great complexity of the problems involved and help to shed light on promising directions of the future.[147]

---

[146] Paul R. Lehman, "The Predictive Measurement of Musical Success," Journal of Research in Music Education, Volume XVII, No. 1, Spring, 1969.

[147] Paul R. Lehman, "A Selected Bibliography of Works on Music Testing," Journal of Research in Music Education, Volume XVII, No. 4, Winter, 1969, p. 427.

Lehman was able to give a clearer picture of measurement in music, its negation by music educators and its importance to the future of music education, when he stated in the winter issue:

> As the shortcomings of past efforts at evaluation have become increasingly apparent, some music educators have adopted a negative attitude toward all forms of testing. Mounting pressures from governmental and other agencies for effective evaluation of educational programs, however, are forcing the music education profession to reexamine its position regarding testing.
>
> Many persons are of the opinion that the failure of music educators to define their objectives in precise and specific terms has been the greatest single obstacle to the meaningful evaluation of musical instruction. Efforts to overcome this barrier must be considered prerequisite to the comprehensive assessment of affective and psychomotor as well as cognitive behaviors in music.[148]

The subject matter of periodicals concerned with music and the subject matter of the psychologist's research in education seem, except for a very few points, to be totally unrelated. Since elementary music education must function as a vital part of the total learning picture, it would seem extremely important to work together, to identify common philosophies and goals. But since there was little written regarding contemporary philosophies or goals on the part of that specific teacher who teaches the elementary music program, it became one of the motivating factors of this study to try and inquire as to whether present practices take into account contemporary interests and concerns of either the philosopher or the psychologist in music and in education.

---

[148] Ibid.

Aesthetic Education in Music

Contemporary educational problems clearly indicate that there is a growing interest and need for aesthetic understanding. These problems lie in the realm of educational understanding of purpose and goal as well as in basic concepts of the art of music.

In earlier years the literature in musical aesthetics was dominated by Max Schoen and Carl E. Seashore. Experimental psychologists avoided aesthetic problems because of the intangibility in matters of feeling. It 1927 Seashore said of musical aesthetics that it had been and still was in a sentimentalizing era with an occasional injection of disjointed physics, psychology, and philosophy. He also added at that time that the time had come to rewrite that branch of study.[149]

Even earlier (1925) Max Schoen published a set of three tests for musical feeling and understanding; these were standardized, and he found them to correlate highly with musicalness as a whole as manifested by actual accomplishment.[150] At that time there was no great chasm dividing studies of a psychological nature and those of an aesthetic nature. Inquiry into the nature of music and the understanding of music had germinated only recently from investigations of a more physiological nature. The laboratory in musical research had been devoted entirely to investigations such as those of Charles M. Diserens, who found that music tends to reduce or delay fatigue; that music speeds up such voluntary activities as typewriting and handwriting; that music increases the extent of muscular reflexes employed in writing and drawing; that music produces marked but variable effects upon pulse, volume, and blood pressure, etc.[151]

---

[149] Carl E. Seashore, "A Basis for the Approach to Quantitive Studies in Aesthetics of Music," American Journal of Psychology, 39: 141-144, 1927.

[150] Max Schoen, "Tests of Musical Feeling and Musical Understanding," Journal of Comparative Psychology 5: 31-37, February, 1925.

When research in music moved from physiological interests to psychological interests, aesthetics was being defined by Schoen as a study of the beautiful, and Seashore was defining beautiful as simply deviation from the normal.

The aesthetic perspective of music education differs dramatically from the socio-psychological perspective. Contemporary music aesthetics is concerned with the nature of the art, with the criteria for value judgments, and with theoretical aspects of particular problems in the arts. It is concerned principally with music and only peripherally as this discipline reflects the social mores of any particular period or the political protest of any particular era in history. It is less concerned with nonartistic ends or nonartistic uses than with the empirical basis for perception and reaction--the significance of the interaction of music and man. It is interested in maintaining the integrity of music as an art and, as such, it becomes a vital factor in the development of music education for it must answer the philosophical questions of purpose and value.

As a traditional branch of philosophy, aesthetics often utilizes logical procedures and draws its conclusions by incisive methods of reasoning. In his answer to the question of what the study of aesthetics is, Abraham A. Schwadron, one of today's foremost contributors to the field of aesthetic education, points out these important implications for the musician, for the music educator, and for philosophy:

---

[151] Charles M. Diserens, "Reactions to Musical Stimuli," The Psychological Bulletin 20: 173-199, April, 1923.

> For the musician in general:
>
> The study of aesthetics affords a unique opportunity to examine the nature of the musical arts: its meanings, its implied emotionalisms, its effects and values in relation to derived beliefs of reality and truth.
>
> For the music educator:
>
> The implications of aesthetics are manifested daily in his professional relationships with others, in his actual teaching role, in his concept of the significance of the musical arts, and in his reasoned beliefs in support of formal education as a means of uplifting musical tastes.
>
> For philosophy:
>
> Aesthetics has been defined as the study of the beautiful, resulting, for example, in the establishment of criteria which would aid one to determine whether and why one particular composition is beautiful while another is not.[152]

Bennett Reimer, another leader in the field of aesthetic education, defines aesthetics as that field of thought which is concerned with questions of the nature and value of the arts. In his recent book, A Philosophy of Music Education,[153] Reimer deals directly with musical aesthetics and with aesthetic education.

The need for philosophical approaches to basic questions in music education has been apparent for many years. Some significant contributions were made in the 1958 publication of the National Society for the Study of Education, Basic Concepts in Music Education. Foster MacMurray stated:

---

[152] Abraham A. Schwadron, op. cit., p. 4.

[153] Bennett Reimer, op. cit.

> The aim of music education ... is: to help everyone to further awareness of patterns of sound as an aesthetic component in the world of experience; to increase each person's capacity to control the availability of aesthetic richness through music; and to transform the public musical culture into a recognized part of each person's environment.[154]

In the same publication Harry S. Broudy also presented strong arguments in favor of the music curriculum's being based on aesthetic considerations:

> To describe the musical experience is, in part at least, a problem in aesthetics; to define the role of musical experience in life as a whole is a problem of ethics and value theory; to test the relation of music to cosmic and human nature is a problem of metaphysics, and the entire discussion should be respectful of the rules of logic.[155]

The resolution of many controversial topics in elementary music education could profit a great deal from analysis based on philosophical concepts. Schwadron pointed out the controversial reaction to the 1964 Report of the Yale Seminar on Music Education as one example of "the urgency of existing problems in music education which are, by and large, problems of aesthetics."[156]

Study of the "aesthetic experience" is today based largely on an increasing field of writings such as that by Susanne K. Langer, whose early work, Feeling and Form, concentrated on the principles of creation and expression.[157] (This was not Langer's first work but it followed her Philosophy in a New Key,[158] which concerned theories of symbolism.) Bennett Reimer calls Feeling and Form "a keystone book in Langer's edifice of thought ... her most detailed explanations of each major order of art."[159] Reimer bases his philosophy of the aesthetic experience almost completely on the Langer analyses and syntheses, especially those developed in her latest work, Mind: An Essay on Human Feeling.[160] Langer's monumental works are of great depth and great import, but for the music educator the works of Reimer and Schwadron are the most closely related to philosophical resolutions of specific contemporary problems. Both are concerned with the practicing music educator today; both, with an understanding of the nature, the purpose, and the values in the pursuit of music education.

---

[154] Foster MacMurray, op. cit., p. 41.

[155] Harry S. Broudy, op. cit., p. 63.

[156] Abraham A. Schwadron, op. cit., p. iv.

Summary

To understand the problems of contemporary elementary music education, it is necessary to go farther than researching only the literature of music education. Although this concern--the literature of music education--is primary, there are a number of very important areas of related study that must be included in order to have a more comprehensive picture of the field of early childhood education in music. Recent literature related to elementary music education includes studies in general education (especially that on the elementary level), in psychology of music, and in the philosophy or aesthetics of music education. This chapter highlighted recent developments in each of those areas of research, all of which are closely related to elementary music education. It has discussed the background for understanding the attitudes of the music educators as expressed through their journals, books, and other publications. It has reviewed the thinking of the contemporary psychologist and educator, especially in areas related to problems in elementary music. It has reported the thinking of the psychologist in music as well as the philosopher in music in order to be able to interpret more adequately the present problems and practices as investigated in this report.

---

[157] Susanne K. Langer, Feeling and Form, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952).

[158] Susanne K. Langer, Philosophy in a New Key, (New York: Mentor Books, 1942).

[159] Bennett Reimer, op. cit., p. 71.

[160] Susanne K. Langer, Mind: An Essay on Human Feeling, Volume I, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1967).

CHAPTER IV

THE SURVEY: PROCEDURE AND RESULTS

One of the primary objectives of this study was to attempt to discover whether or not the music educator "in the field," doing the actual work in elementary music education, was concerned with the same problems, the same philosophies and goals, etc. as the music educator doing the writing, discussing, and proposing. Are theory and practice related in music education? Actual observation by the writer of many schools in large and small districts in the United States led to the hypothetical assumption that there was some discrepancy between what the music educator was writing about theoretically and what was actually in practice. In attempting to make valid discoveries of a more comprehensive nature about actual practice in the nation, several possibilities were considered. The questionnaire to representative districts across the country seemed the best possible mode of inquiry despite these obvious problems:

1. There were many questions that needed to be answered by a large group of representative music educators. Would they take the time and trouble to answer a lengthy questionnaire? A brief questionnaire would have been of little value.) Are music educators tired of questionnaires anyway?
2. The information desired consisted of actual statements of the practicing music educators regarding their philosophies, goals, and music programs. Would they take the time and

trouble if the questionnaire were not a multiple-choice type, but instead required statements of thought?

It is relatively simple to "interpret" the attitudes, interests, and problems in the field of music education by keeping abreast of music education publications, but is this a true reflection of what is actually practiced in the elementary schools of the nation? What are the problems of those teaching music in the elementary classroom or teaching instrumental training to elementary school children? Is there adequate time set aside for classroom music? Is there, as frequently claimed, a shortage of music specialists? Are there adequate facilities and equipment? Are the instructors in elementary music using the innovational ideas about which so much has been written lately? Have the music programs funded by federal grants influenced the elementary music education of the nation? These and many other questions of a like nature were of deep concern.

In discussions with other music educators the subject of the relationship between the size of the district to a number of factors in elementary music education constantly emerged: Was there any significant relationship between the size of the school district and the music program? (The McQuerrey study, for example, reported that in California the size of the school district significantly affected the employment and the use of special music teachers.) For whom were the writers in music education journals speaking? For the larger districts? For the smaller districts? For both? A recent investigation of school districts in the United States brought out the following unexpected information:

1. There are approximately 16,492 school districts in the United

States that begin with either pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, or first grade and include the intervening years through sixth grade.

2. These 16,492 school districts represent an amazingly wide span of pupil population: some school districts have less than 300 pupils in their entirety (and this does not mean that there is only one school in the district) and some have over 25,000 pupils in their system.
3. An even more amazing fact was the knowledge gained that nearly one-third of these districts is composed of systems which have less than 300 pupils in the entire system. There are approximately 5,313 of these very small districts composed of one or several schools in which the total district pupil population is less than 300.[161]

Table 1 is extracted from the United States Directory of Public School Systems, 1970-71 (Table 2, page 7), to indicate only those school districts that cover grade six and omitting those districts that begin with grade seven, etc. (The "K" includes pre-kindergarten, of which there are relatively few.)

---

[161] United States Directory of Public School Systems, 1970-71, (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971), OE-20005-71.

TABLE 1[162]

Number of Operating Local Public School Systems, by Grade Span and Size of Systems, for the United States: Fall, 1970-71.

Span of school system	K-6	1-6	K-8	1-8	K-9	1-9	K-12	1-12	Total
Number of systems	298	414	2,745	2,032	33	23	6,734	4,213	16,492
Systems with 300 or more pupils	159	46	986	305	30	13	6,262	3,378	11,179
25,000 or more	0	0	1	1	0	0	143	44	189
10,000 to 24,999	3	0	27	7	0	0	351	148	536
5,000 to 9,999	9	0	53	10	0	0	629	369	1,070
2,500 to 4,999	12	1	107	26	2	0	1,154	660	1,962
1,000 to 2,499	41	6	281	71	14	5	1,935	939	3,292
600 to 999	33	14	190	57	5	3	1,062	479	1,843
300 to 599	61	25	327	133	9	5	988	739	2,287
Systems with less than 300 pupils	139	368	1,759	1,727	3	10	472	835	5,313

---

[162] _Ibid_., Table 2, Page 7.

With regard to the existence of pre-kindergarten as well as kindergarten in the public schools of the United States, another surprising discovery came from a study of the Directory. It was found that there are no pre-kindergarten public school classes in most of the states' schools; in fact, there are also states that do not offer kindergarten either. To be more exact, there are six states listed that do not even offer kindergarten, let alone pre-kindergarten; children in those states begin their free public education in the first grade. There are also a number of states that have some kindergartens, with many districts within those same states that do not include kindergarten.

Table 2 is a list of the states, their total number of operating school districts, a breakdown of those districts into four sizes, and an account of the existence of free, state-provided, pre-kindergarten or kindergarten. (This does not, of course, include either Headstart programs or private kindergartens operating in public school buildings.)

TABLE 2[163]

Tabulation of Operating School Districts in the United States

	Total number of districts	Number of pupils				Districts with pre-kindergarten	Districts with kindergarten
		Over 10,000	1,000 to 9,999	300 to 999	Under 300		
Alabama	118	14	101	3	0	0	0
Alaska	29	2	7	7	13	0	20
Arizona	283	10	67	75	131	0	29
Arkansas	385	4	101	187	93	0	0
California	1,123	114	380	239	390	127	865
Colorado	181	12	53	52	64	0	168
Connecticut	171	16	101	40	14	20	162
Delaware	26	3	19	2	2	0	120
District of Columbia	1	1	0	0	0	1	1
Florida	67	25	39	3	0	0	56
Georgia	190	16	158	15	1	0	4
Hawaii	1	1	0	0	0	1	1
Idaho	115	3	40	41	31	0	0
Illinois	1,176	24	413	402	337	0	672
Indiana	317	24	233	49	11	6	221
Iowa	454	7	148	277	22	0	453
Kansas	311	5	89	178	39	0	295
Kentucky	192	4	154	30	4	0	12
Louisiana	66	20	46	0	0	0	34
Maine	239	1	86	40	112	0	175
Maryland	24	15	9	0	0	7	11
Massachusetts	379	19	195	102	63	4	160
Michigan	626	30	370	115	111	0	626
Minnesota	660	17	153	230	260	0	320
Mississippi	155	6	136	12	1	0	0

---

[163] Data provided by the United States Office of Education, February, 1972.

	Total number of districts	Number of pupils				Districts with pre-kindergarten	Districts with kindergarten
		Over 10,000	1,000 to 9,999	300 to 999	Under 300		
Missouri	647	17	166	216	248	0	391
Montana	684	2	30	69	583	0	22
Nebraska	1,461	3	39	145	1,274	0	444
Nevada	17	2	9	3	3	0	13
New Hampshire	156	1	38	47	70	0	28
New Jersey	573	20	309	166	78	8	518
New Mexico	89	6	35	26	22	0	20
New York	742	43	486	152	61	66	730
North Carolina	152	30	121	1	0	0	27
North Dakota	365	3	13	99	250	0	6
Ohio	631	30	499	96	6	0	564
Oklahoma	667	5	89	225	348	5	298
Oregon	349	4	90	84	171	0	30
Pennsylvania	550	34	468	44	4	0	379
Rhode Island	35	4	27	8	1	0	32
South Carolina	93	19	71	3	0	0	0
South Dakota	262	2	27	102	131	0	258
Tennessee	147	12	112	22	1	0	0
Texas	1,192	47	324	373	448	0	23
Utah	40	7	24	7	2	0	40
Vermont	216	0	26	75	151	0	31
Virginia	132	23	104	2	0	0	34
Washington	320	15	103	98	104	0	201
West Virginia	55	11	44	0	0	0	7
Wisconsin	455	13	201	195	46	12	405
Wyoming	132	2	17	28	85	0	46
Totals	17,451	748	6,570	4,385	5,786	257	8,952
Percentages	100.0	4.3	37.6	25.1	33.2	1.5	51.3

---

[164] Like Washington, D. C., the territories of American Samoa, Canal Zone, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands all operate under one district. None have preschools except American Samoa and Guam. They all have kindergartens.

Table 2 shows that some of the states have a very large number of small districts or systems while a few states have an unusually large number of large districts. This was an important factor in designing a questionnaire that might gain information and reflect attitudes of music educators both from the small districts as well as the larger districts. What kinds of music programs might be found in some of the 1,247 districts in the state of Nebraska, each of which had less than 300 pupils in their entire school or schools? Or in California where there were 114 districts, each of which had over 10,000 pupils?

Aside from the nature of the geography of the state, relative population of the state, historical division into kinds of systems, industrialization, or socio-economic factors, it is of significant interest to note the relationship of the programs offered. Who teaches the classroom music in the smaller districts, the specialist or the class teacher? Do they have instrumental training classes? Is there as much time spent for music in the elementary schools of the smaller districts as is spent in the larger districts? Does equality of musical opportunities in music education exist in the nation? And is that equality--if it exists--struggling for "quality" at the same time?

The surprising fact that there are still in existence some states that do not offer free public education at the kindergarten level brings into sharp relief the time lag between research of the past twenty years and changes in basic elementary education. The question becomes: At a time when research has verified conclusively that the greatest amount of learning takes place in early childhood (roughly between the ages of four and eight), how can we have public schools that do not even offer free pre-kindergarten? There follows the question of when regularly scheduled music instruction begins in the elementary schools.

Analysis of Problems

In researching the existing music education programs of the elementary schools of the United States in order to discover practices and problems, the difficulties were essentially these:

1. A great deal of information was needed to cover a wide area of interest.
2. Many questions would have to be formulated in order to cover so many points of inquiry.
3. The information was needed from many representative districts in order to achieve statistical validity.

Since the use of a questionnaire was determined to be the best way to secure this broad field of knowledge (as stated earlier), the problem of its design as one that would yield the desired information became foremost. Gathering information that would truly reflect the thinking and the opinions of music educators from very small as well as very large districts, from isolated schools as well as schools in the heart of the inner city, was the primary goal. No single questionnaire could provide the needed in-depth study nor all the answers from such a diverse group. But a single questionnaire could reveal the need for more comprehensive study and could expose the situation that exists in elementary music education. Most important was to maintain a free, honest mode of response, to avoid directing the thinking of those from whom the information was desired by implication or suggestion. The chance of the questionnaires' being returned with frequent "blanks" for answers was also to be considered as significant. (On questions of music philosophy, for example, "no answer" could also be indicative of a valid response.)

The first step in bringing into focus the information desired was to simply list all the questions for which this investigator was seeking answers. The list at first totaled more than 100 questions. Since a single page was the most desirable format, this number had to be limited. The many questions were next organized and systematically classified in order to reexamine the areas of concern and significance. It was discovered that the questions could be organized under five general headings of inquiry:

1. A--those related to the schools in the various districts (mostly nonmusic questions)
2. B--those related to the basic philosophy of the music program
3. C--those related to financial assistance for the music program outside the district budget
4. D--those related to the teacher of music in the elementary schools
5. E--those related to the music lessons offered in the elementary schools

Deletion of lesser important questions, rewording of some questions, and reorganizing of some so that they would become subquestions or parts of main questions brought the total number down to 60. Respacing of questions on a single sheet of legal sized paper in order to give more answer space to certain questions requiring it meant no room for voluntary statements tha[illegible]ght be revealing of present problems. The statements "Please see reverse" and "Thank you" were placed at the bottom of the sheet. The reverse side suggested: "Further comments will be deeply appreciated."

Once priorities were established and only the most important questions were retained, the kind of respondent desired and the most statistically valid method of gaining the information from the respondent were determined. It was decided to enlist necessary expertise to aid in the statistical tabulation of all the materials. The chairman of the computer science department at California Polytechnic State University (San Luis Obispo) recommended graduate student David Kimble for the assignment; Kimble was engaged and undertook the handling of the questionnaire. Several discussion sessions followed during which Kimble pointed out that the questionnaire decided upon (no multiple choice) could be as valid statistically as other types but would take much more time and closer scrutiny to evaluate properly and interpret; further, this type of questionnaire might bring less response than a simple check sheet type. The wisdom of the type of questionnaire was reconsidered. It seemed of paramount importance to hear the voice of the ordinary, everyday music educator who, after all, was responsible for carrying out the program. It was thought expedient to address the questionnaire to the superintendent of the school district with the request that he refer the questionnaire to a member of his staff who was knowledgeable in the district's current practice in the area of elementary music education.

The Questionnaire

The purpose of the questionnaire was to investigate practices and problems of elementary music education in the United States in 1972 as indicated by those active in and knowledgeable of the situation in their own district. The hypotheses upon which the questionnaire was based were developed as a result of careful observation during the past 15 years from the vantage point of the following elementary music education activities on the part of the investigator:

1. visiting--elementary "music in the classroom" and "instrumental training" classes in large and small districts in many cities in the United States
2. teaching--college classes in music for classroom teachers as well as supervising cadet teaching in elementary music education
3. conducting--elementary music workshops, demonstration sessions, and in-service training classes for hundreds of elementary classroom teachers (as a music supervisor and as a coordinator for elementary music education)
4. discussing--elementary music education problems with other professionals in the field at frequent regional, national, and international conferences

The Hypotheses

1. Elementary music education in the United States is presently declining in both quantity and quality.
    a. It suffers from a lack of adequate knowledge and skill

on the part of the majority of those teaching classroom music.

b. It suffers from a lack of professional interest and willingness to teach elementary music on the part of those who have the knowledge and skill.

c. It suffers from a lack of professional interest in recent research and findings related to early learning and individualization.

d. It suffers from a lack of genuine concern on the part of those who administer the programs--supervisors, principals, etc.

e. It suffers from financial cutbacks (affecting both classroom and instrumental specialists) imposed by budgetary problems.

f. It suffers from not having administrative personnel in key positions--state and federal--to indicate the problems of districts, local and national.

2. Elementary music education in the United States is, in 1972, undefinable in terms of direction, purpose, or philosophy.

   a. It suffers from diffuse, unorganized ideas as to its philosophy and its goals.

   b. It suffers from a lack of understanding of its nature and values.

   c. It suffers from a lack of assistance from its representative national organization, the MENC, to get to the root of its difficulties and begin a program that will eliminate the problems.

d. It suffers from the lack of an in-depth study on a national basis to discover its problems.

The questionnaire was directed at a refutation or confirmation of these hypothetical statements by means of a thorough investigation of the status of elementary music education on a national basis. While such a questionnaire might not yield conclusive answers it could, nevertheless, point up those differences that seem to prevail between the theory and practice of music education in the elementary school.

The questionnaire was reproduced on 8 1/2" x 13" buff colored mimeograph paper. To assure that the elementary districts chosen to receive the questionnaire were representative of the total population, they had to be chosen from a random sampling according to the suggestions of Miller and Freund:

> A set of observations x_1, x_2 ... x_n constitutes a random sample of size n from a finite population of size N, if it is chosen so that each subset of n of the N elements of the population has the same probability of being selected.[165]

To achieve the random sampling in the handling of this questionnaire, those elementary school districts listed as covering through sixth grade (in the Education Directory produced at the National Center for Educational Statistics)[166] were all numbered so that the probability of selecting any given school district was equal to the probability of selecting any other school district, i.e.,

---

[165] Irwin Miller and John E. Freund, Probability and Statistics for Engineers, (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 126.

[166] Education Directory, 1970-71, National Center for Educational Statistics, (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971).

$P(n_i) = P(n_j) = 1/N \; i \neq j$, where N is the total number of schools.

This was accomplished by using a table of random numbers to choose the 2,009 school districts that were sampled from a total of 16,492 systems listed in the Directory as covering from pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, or grade one through grade six.[167] Achievement House, a special agency for the training of handicapped adults in the city of San Luis Obispo, California, was engaged to reproduce, address, and mail the questionnaire.

Although the questionnaire was dated January 10, 1972, it was not until January 21 that it was actually mailed. Because both the statistician and the investigator were leaving to attend summer sessions in other states, it became necessary to set a deadline date for accepting answers to the questionnaire. The final response date was set for May 1, 1972, in order to allow a month for the calculations, and replies received after that date were not used.

Results of the Questionnaire[168]

The questionnaire, sent to over ten percent of the pre-kindergarten through grade six school districts listed in the aforementioned Directory, brought replies through February, March, and April of 1972. Although there were 460 completed replies received out of a total of 2,009 sent, only 455 were used in this study for the following reasons: One came back from a high school district (error in checking or sending); a second one was completely illegible and incomprehensible; and three arrived too late to be included in this study. The 455 returned questionnaires indicated statistically a 22.65% response, from which calculations were made wherever applicable. It was assumed that the 22.65% respondents answered their questions in the same manner that the other 77.35% would have answered. In the case of specific questions that were incomplete, ambiguous, or contradictory in their answers, the particular answer to that question was not recorded at all in the compiled data. (For example, a respondent reported that he had never had financial aid--state, federal, or other--and next reported that the program was still functioning.) All phases of a question erroneously answered in this manner were omitted from the data. Total number of replies on different questions were therefore not always the same; this factor did bear on the statistical calculations.

---

[167] W. H. Beyer, Editor, Handbook of Tables for Probability and Statistics, (Cleveland: Chemical Rubber Company, 1966).

[168] See Appendix H for copy of the questionnaire.

The returns were first organized according to the states from which they were returned as indicated by the zip code stamp on the returned questionnaire. It was found that although every state in the United States with the exception of Hawaii (and the territories of American Samoa, Canal Zone, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) was represented, there were 75 returns that bore no postal stamp of any description. Geographic data could therefore not be taken into consideration, and the results of the questionnaire were treated to statistical evaluation on the basis of the United States as a whole. The returns were next organized according to the number of schools that the respondents had indicated were in the district. This produced the information in Table 3.

TABLE 3

Questionnaire Returns According to Number of Schools in the District

Number of elementary schools in the district	Number of questionnaires returned	Percentage of total returned
1	118	26%
2	43	9%
3	32	7%
4	28	6%
5	26	5%
6-10	89	20%
11-25	66	15%
26-50	22	5%
51-100	15	3%
Over 100	8	2%
Had no music program at all	8	2%
Total	455	100%

Table 3 indicates that by far the largest number of returns came from districts with only one school, and the very smallest number of returns came from the largest districts. Eight districts reported that they had no planned music program at all. An interesting difference between the very small and the very large districts also was noted. Most of the large districts did not use the provided prepaid postal form, but returned their questionnaires in large envelopes that also included courses of study, guides, and outlines. (One large district responded to the questionnaire with a note; the request had been referred to their research department for analysis in order to determine whether or not the study was of value to their district. The next message came from the research department and said, in effect, that the study had been evaluated as of value to their district, and that the head of the music department had been requested to respond. The next communication came from that music educator accompanied by much material prepared for the teachers in terms of grade level music expectations.)

A large number of respondents requested that they be given the results of the study. (This mode of interest was also evidenced by the number of responses to early letters of inquiry--to be included on the list of those receiving reviews of the completed study. That the questionnaire was "touching on a very pertinent and sensitive area" was the reaction of one official of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education who also requested a set of results.)

A number of respondents took the time and the trouble to make comments or elaborate further on their own programs on the reverse side of the questionnaire. Of the 447 respondents who had music programs, 168 (37.58%) made comments, some of which were very extensive. Such voluntary information regarding the music programs and the problems of the respondents was considered of paramount importance to the study; hence, it was carefully analyzed and tabulated as an intrinsic part of the results of the study. At first the gathered information was divided into two types of response: (1) those voluntary responses indicative of satisfaction with their own music programs and (2) those indicative of dissatisfaction. A reclassification for voluntary responses was developed according to the following convenient symbol system:

1. ++ respondents who stated specifically that they considered their program "fine," "outstanding," (or some such description) and did not express a need for any changes
2. + respondents who, while not describing their programs as fine or outstanding, did list positive factors, expressed pride in their programs, and offered no statements of need for any change
3. # respondents who simply listed their philosophies, their objectives, their goals, or their activities with no positive or negative expressions
4. - respondents whose expressions indicated that they thought their programs had weaknesses and who indicated the needs of their programs.
5. -- respondents who definitely described their programs as "poor" or "inadequate" and who strongly expressed a need for changes, upgrading, etc.

Tabulated in Table 4 are the voluntary remarks of the respondents according to the five categories.

TABLE 4

Respondents' Voluntary Remarks Regarding Their Programs

Number of schools in the district	Total responses	Total who made voluntary remarks	Indication of degree of satisfaction with their programs				
			++	+	#	-	--
1	118	55	4	6	11	10	24
2	43	11	0	1	4	3	3
3	32	9	0	3	6	0	0
4	28	6	0	1	2	1	2
5	26	11	0	0	4	0	7
6-10	89	28	2	3	8	7	8
11-25	66	28	0	6	10	1	11
26-50	22	8	0	1	2	1	4
51-100	15	8	0	0	4	2	2
Over 100	8	4	0	0	4	0	0
No music program	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	447	168	6	21	55	25	61
Percentages		37.58	3.57	12.50	32.74	14.88	36.31

These voluntary remarks, when analyzed and organized, gave perspective to some of the problems in elementary music education. The remarks were an indication of the attitudes of over one-third of the respondents and, in most cases, were specific expressions of "why" the respondents considered their music programs strong or weak, fine or poor.

It is interesting to note how few of the respondents who made voluntary remarks described their programs as "fine" or "outstanding," how few there were who expressed no need for changes. Following are examples of statements of those who expressed pride in their programs:

> ++ We have a fine program.... We have been known for years as outstanding in music. Most schools do not allow enough time for music.
>
> We have a most unique situation here in that the administration and the public totally back the music education program.

Following are examples of those expressed pride in their programs and expressed no need for change:

> \+ In our music program throughout the _______________ District, a teacher is provided for each school for music. In the system, a curriculum guide is provided by which the music teachers all try to achieve the same goals. (Activities, equipment listed.)
>
> A special supplement was voted in the township which enable this small _______________ town to have a music specialist (supervisor) and three others in our elementary schools. Music is taught primarily for grades 1-6 with uniform basic requirements sent from the supervisor's office monthly. CR teachers are free to add, supplement and be creative, but must meet basic techniques.

A summary list of the points mentioned as bases for the respondents' descriptions of a satisfactory program found many repetitions of these fundamental ideas:

1. A special music teacher was provided for each school (most

frequent).

2. The program had the backing of the administrator, the board, the community (or sometimes all three).
3. Necessary funds were allotted for the program.
4. Time was allocated for the program.
5. Facilities, equipment, musical instruments, and audio-visual aids were made available
6. New approaches were being used.
7. Musical concepts were being developed through a series of steps.
8. The program stressed student needs.
9. Strong emphasis was placed on making music through a variety of musical experiences.

Respondents who described their program as fine, who expressed satisfaction with their program and did not express need for change, totaled only 16.07%. Respondents whose voluntary remarks were limited to a simple listing of goals, philosophies, or musical activities ("#") totaled 32.74%. But more than 50% of all the respondents who made voluntary remarks were not satisfied with their elementary music programs. They specifically expressed needs for change and the reasons for the weaknesses in their programs. Following is a list of the percentages of those respondents' voluntary remarks that expressed satisfaction, dissatisfaction, or simply listed their programs:

++ combined with +: 16.07% satisfied with their programs
# only: 32.74% listed only philosophies, activities, etc.

- combined with --: 51.19% dissatisfied with their programs

A few examples of respondents whose voluntary remarks were classified as negative ("-") are:

> \- Our problem is lack of discipline, which interferes with learning. Unless we can obtain a new teacher that can discipline students we may drop music as well. We would then have music each day in the classroom with records and record players from the publishers.
>
> I am trying every way under the sun to rebuild desire.... I could not have ever believed that one instructor could so completely destroy a student body's desire or any type of enthusiasm.
>
> We have no money for a full-year music program of any kind, so we use Title I funds to hire a teacher for 10 weeks a year to teach choral music to grades 1-8.
>
> Our music class is by records. We have no music books.... The children bring the records from home.
>
> Almost absolute lack of musical interest in this area. From discussion, I ascertain that this prevails throughout the state of _______________.

Examples of the voluntary remarks of respondents classified as double minus ("--") are indicative of poor programs in elementary music. Stated were reasons for dissatisfaction and areas needing change:

> \-- Few classes get the amount of classroom music they need. The state academic testing program plus our local concentration of technically trained parents makes classroom music a very low priority activity. No one will admit this and most people say ours is a good music program. This is sheer bologna! At one time we did have a fairly good program.
>
> We have 14 specialists to serve 17,000 students.... Our budget for last year (1971) was $2,700. Thus you can appreciate how limited we are and the need for grants that we are always seeking.
>
> We have a good program on paper, but lack of administrative interest resulted in ...
>
> Until two years ago, we had music specialists (itinerant) who taught in the elementary schools.... We are now working

> under a staffing formula which allows one specialist for each twenty teachers in a school.... But the specialist may be one of four different areas (music, art, P. E., or counseling).... We have 52 elementary schools, 24 covered either full-time or half-time by specialists ... and 28 are without any specialists and the classroom teachers are supposed to teach music.
>
> Our staff of 8 consultants to assist 1,200 teachers was recently cut to 4--so visits are fewer and farther apart. Classroom teachers are now more poorly prepared in music and less ready to learn, so elementary music presents a very bleak picture in my opinion. (80 schools) Ultimately, this will be apparent in secondary music.
>
> "Music" as such, is pretty weak in ______________ School District ... it is all rather disconnected ... each school rather doing its own thing ... depending on the importance each principal gives to music.

From the extracted remarks a list of most frequently mentioned points of dissatisfaction with the present music programs was compiled. This list is much more extensive than the points listed in satisfactory programs, and is almost opposite in its statements:

1. There is a lack of teacher skills, lack of teacher training.
2. There is a lack of student interest in music; students are bored, unenthusiastic.
3. There are no music texts, no musical materials, no musical equipment, no musical instruments, no recordings, etc.
4. There are no funds for a full-year music program of any kind (ten weeks only).
5. There are no funds for a full-time music teacher; cuts have been made in special personnel.
6. There is no time on the school schedule for music.
7. The problem is discipline; it is impossible to find music teachers who can handle the discipline problems.

8. There is no support from the administration.
9. There is no support from the community.
10. Teachers cannot be found to fill the positions.
11. The location and the size of the school limits the music program (too small).
12. The size of the district causes many problems (too large).
13. The student-teacher ratio is impossible.
14. All music is directed toward the band.
15. Using TV only for K-3 is inadequate.
16. There is no organized plan; music is only a "fun" thing.
17. There is no carryover from music specialist to the classroom teacher.
18. Music as a school subject has a very low priority in the community, with the administration, and in the school.

A few respondents stated that the questionnaire did not apply to the conditions of their district. Some stated it was designed for smaller districts; others, for larger districts. From the beginning it was noted that no questionnaire could be designed to cover the problems of either extreme--the very small or the very large district. The questionnaire was therefore designed to cover the known problems of the medium sized district, and complete freedom of expression was allowed for all questions. Despite the limitations of the questionnaire, a great deal of information was gathered; at least the differences in problems, practices, etc., that might exist between the very large and the very small districts could now be studied more closely. A report on the relationship between the size of the district and the existence of problems is included in the following discussion.

Organization of the Data

Two sets of charts (or tables and charts) are reported in this study. (See Appendixes.) The first set of charts, set "A," represents the raw data, tabulated according to number of schools in the district or according to the primary goals. The number of schools in the district was organized as in Table 4: school districts composed of only one school, of two schools, three schools, four schools, five schools; then grouping six to ten schools, 11 to 25 schools, 26 to 50 schools, 51 to 100 schools, and those districts that reported having over 100 schools (including one district of over 200 elementary schools). Because of the statistical needs of the contingency table (the restriction that all frequencies in a two-way classification should be greater than five applied to our situation), it became necessary to revise this grouping. There were many cells in the raw data with as few as one or two respondents in that category. While these reflected negative response--which was just as important to the study as positive response--the exception to the restriction (allowing that no more than two numbers can be less than five and must be greater than one) was infrequently utilized in the statistical analysis. Whenever this requirement or restriction is not met, i.e., the requirement that all frequencies in the two-way classification be greater than five, the usual procedure is to combine classifications in order to yield the desired condition. Because of this necessity to reduce the tables and combine classifications, only the second set of tables, "B," was used for statistical analysis. (Where size of the district was a factor, for example, the second set was combined as follows: school districts having from one to three schools, four to ten schools, 11 to 26 schools, and all districts having 26 or more schools in one category.)

While the first set of tables ("A") did not lend itself to statistical analysis, it did contain some very interesting and very important points for observation; comments on these points will be included in this report as each table is presented. The first set of tables was very interesting because of information obtained concerning: (1) what the respondents considered to be "innovational"; (2) how they expressed their philosophies, their goals, etc. The study lent itself mostly to an analysis of the various factors in relation to the size of the school districts; therefore less is reported in terms of relationships between stated goals and other factors.

The following is an example of the format upon which the statistical analysis was made. The example refers to Set B 12.1:

1. Hypothesis:

   H_o: the size of the school district and the fact that the music is taught by the classroom teacher are independent

   H_a: the size of the school district and the fact that the music is taught by the classroom teacher are related

2. Level of Significance:

   $\alpha = .05$

   One-tailed test

3. Test Statistics:

$$G = 2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{c} \sum_{j=1}^{r} (f_{ij} \ln f_{ij}) - \sum_{i=1}^{c} \left(\left(\sum_{j=1}^{r} f_{ij} \right) \ln \left(\sum_{j=1}^{r} f_{ij} \right) \right) \right.$$

$$- \sum_{j=1}^{r} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{c} f_{ij} \right) \ln \left(\sum_{i=1}^{c} f_{ij} \right)$$

$$\left. + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{c} \sum_{j=1}^{r} f_{ij} \right) \ln \left(\sum_{i=1}^{c} \sum_{j=1}^{r} f_{ij} \right) \right)$$ [169]

4. Rejection Region:

$$G > X^2_{\alpha, \ ((r-1)\ (c-1))} = 12.5916$$

5. Calculation:

$G = 24.657$

6. Statement:

Reject H_o

Thus the size of the school district and the fact that music is taught by the classroom teacher are related.

Interpretation of the Data: Sets of Tables, "A" and "B"

As stated previously, the "A" tables charted the raw data and the "B" tables charted the statistical analysis; copes of each table may be found in the appendixes. The following interpretation of all tables and the raw data were organized according to the five areas of interest developed at the beginning of this study, i.e., questions related to the schools, to the philosophies, to the goals, to the finance, to the teachers, and to the instruction in elementary music education. "A" and

---

[169] Robert R. Sokal and F. James Rohlf, Biometry, (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1969), p. 600.

"B" tables and percentages will differ due to the inclusion or exclusion of different factors involved and being studied.

Questions Related to Public Schools of the United States[170]

1. When does free public instruction begin in the United States?

   Table A 1.1. This table charted the answers of the respondents to the basic question as to whether the elementary public schools of the nation are responding to the challenge of contemporary psychology to the effect that the greatest amount of learning takes place in the earlier years. Only 5.52% of the respondents indicated that they had pre-kindergarten classes; 71.79% stated that public school began with kindergarten; and 22.69% stated that public school began with grade one. The fact that over one-fifth of the elementary children in American schools are not offered free public education until they are of first grade age is highly critical, considering the nature of the egalitarian society.

   Table B 1.1. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district, i.e., the number of schools in the district, and the grade level at which public instruction begins. An inference at the 95% confidence level can here be drawn that the larger districts have a higher number of schools that begin public instruction at the pre-kindergarten level than do the smaller districts. The great majority of school districts

---

[170] See Appendix A.

(71.79%), regardless of size, begin at the kindergarten level. With the exception of large districts (26 or more schools), more schools actually begin instruction with grade one that begin with pre-kindergarten. In the smaller districts it can be seen that the ratio of first grade starters to pre-kindergarten starters is approximately 6:1.

2. When does music instruction begin?

Table A 1.2. This table charted the answers to the question as to "when" music instruction begins in the public schools. The eight respondents that stated that they had no music programs were recorded on this table. Of these eight, five were in the "one-school" district. For the most part organized music instruction begins in either kindergarten or grade one; there were, however, a few of the smaller districts reporting no music instruction until grades two, three, four, five, and even six.

Table B 1.2. The statistical analysis revealed that there was no significant relationship between the size of the school district and the grade level at which it was stated that music education began. However, despite the fact that at a confidence level of 95% the data showed no significant relationship between the two factors, more of the smaller districts (which had a few cases of late start) do begin organized music education instruction earlier than do the larger districts. Districts of 26 and more schools were equally divided, with 50% starting in pre-kindergarten or kindergarten and 50% in grade one.

Questions Related to the Basic Philosophies of the Music Program[171]

1. Is the program modeled after an educational philosopher?

Table A 2.1. This table simply charted the raw data and indicated that almost 50% of the respondents stated their music program was not modeled after an educational philosopher. It charted the ideas expressed as philosophy and the names of those listed as philosophical models. Of the 444 total responses on this question, the names of only five specific educational philosophers are reported at all (and these only infrequently): Froebel (once); Dewey (twice); Skinner (once); Bruner (twice); and Piaget (once). Some respondents did, however, answer this question with other ideas and with the names of music philosophers or music educators. Forty-eight named specific music educators in this question. Respondents also stated they based their philosophy on that of the building principal, the classroom teacher, the MENC, etc. No genuine indication of basic philosophy could be found.

Table B 2.1. The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the size of the school district and the fact that the music program was or was not modeled after a particular educational philosopher. At a 95% confidence level, despite no significance in the relationship, there is still shown a slight tendency for the larger districts to model their programs after some educational philosopher (more so than for the smaller districts). Disregarding size completely and taking the data as a whole, it can be stated with 95% confidence that 75.09% of the totel districts reporting do not model their music programs after an educational philosopher and that further (with the same confidence level), only between 19.71% and 30.10% of all the districts in the nation do model their music education programs after an educational philosopher.

---

[171] See Appendix B.

2. Was the program modeled after a musician or music educator? Table A 3.1. Although the basic question asked if the music education program was modeled after an educational philosopher, responses indicated names of music philosophers and music educators. These were also tabulated. There was no statistical analysis made from this chart, but the lack of response to the total question is noteworthy and the mention of particular musicians, etc. was important. Of the 455 respondents, 52 (11.43%) stated that they modeled their music programs after particular musicians or music educators. This could be interpreted in a variety of ways: (1) that the majority recognized no particular determined philosophy; (2) that they were unfamiliar with newer programs; or even (3) that elementary music education is individually tailored to suit the needs of the district rather than to follow some established philosophy, etc. However, out of 52 respondents that did name a musician, a music educator, or a philosopher in music, the most frequently cited was Kodály (21 times),

with others in relative order: Kodály-Orff (14 times), Richards (five), and Orff (four). Mursell was also named four times. The small number of answers in this category made statistical evaluation impossible; recommendations for further study in this area are presented later in this report.

3. What is the basic music education philosophy?

Table A 4.1. Sixty-four of the respondents did not answer this question at all, and 16 said that they had no philosophy. The many ideas cited by the remainder of the respondents as to their philosophy were organized and categorized in the next sets of charts. Statistical analysis for this data was not possible because of the requirements of the contingency table. Percentage comparisons only are made on this chart.

Table A 4.2. This table charted the various ideas expressed as the basic philosophy of the music program. There is no uniformity of thought as to what their philosophies stress, no pattern of philosophical ideas. On the contrary, the ideas expressed so frequently overlapped the next question regarding chief goals as to lead the investigator to believe that there seems to be little difference in the minds of the respondents between philosophy and goal. Statistical analysis was not possible on this question, but it can be reported that the "ideas" most frequently listed as "philosophy" for the music program were embodied in such descriptive notions as: (1) fun, enjoyment; (2) music for every child, the Child's Bill of Rights; (3) literacy and skills in music; (4) appreciation and enrichment.

4. What do music educators report are their chief goals for their music programs?

   Table A 5.1. This table charted the number of respondents who did not answer the question at all (80) and organized into similar categories all the ideas expressed as primary or chief goals for the music programs. There were ten frequently repeated, seemingly different categories that could be identified and a few infrequently reported that were classified as "other goals." No valid statistical analysis could be developed from these diverse data. Out of the 365 tabulated responses, the ten different primary goals were developed as a basis for understanding the objectives of the practicing music educators.

The overlapping previously mentioned with regard to respondents' statements of philosophies and goals is evidenced in the tabulation of answers to the next question (as well as in the chart showing the relationship of answers for primary and secondary goals, Table 5). However, some interesting--if strange--responses also appeared as philosophies and goals:

> Administrators think and/or say "other things" more important.
>
> Goal: to keep the same administration long enough to upgrade the program.
>
> K-6 is self-contained, therefore non-technical.
>
> "If there's time" is our philosophy.
>
> Our goal is to reach as many students as possible with the least cost.

We have a good program on paper, but in practice?

Goal: to find a principal who thinks music of some value.

Furthermore, as stated earlier, many of the larger districts returned the questionnaire with their outlines or guides and instructed the researcher on questions regarding philosophies and goals to see the accompanying materials, the statement of policy, the outline, etc. A search of these curriculum guides did not reveal much in terms of philosophical inquiry. Notable among a few exceptions to this, however, was the Iowa City Community School District Elementary Curriculum and Resource Guide (cited earlier). Here the philosophy was stated as being based upon the philosophy of music education of Edwin Gordon, as stated in his recent Psychology of Music Teaching; the goals and developments of musical concepts were clearly identified and organized.

5. What do music educators state as their secondary goals?

Table A 6.1. This table revealed the fact that goals stated by some respondents as "primary" are cited by others in identical language as "secondary" goals. There could be no statistical analysis for this data. The goal descriptions were identical; what was primary for one music educator was secondary for another. Only comparative and proportional analyses could be made. Whereas in the case of the primary goals 80 respondents (17.98%) did not answer at all, in the case of the secondary goals 118 (26.52%) did not state secondary goals. Table 5 charts the four most popular goals stated by the same respondents as primary and secondary and ranked according to frequency of statement.

TABLE 5

Comparison of Respondents' Primary and Secondary Goals

Stated goals	Chart listing: A 5.1 & A 6.1	Respondents' statements in percentage and in rank			
		Primary	Rank	Secondary	Rank
For fun/enjoyment in music	(A)	19.78%	1st	3.82%	
For "love" of music	(B)	2.92%		0.67%	
For appreciation/ understanding in music	(C)	19.33%	2nd	11.91%	3rd
For participation/ involvement in music	(D)	11.01%	4th	6.74%	4th
For literacy/basic skills in music	(E)	11.91%	3rd	24.27%	1st
For performance skills in music	(F)	2.25%		14.38%	2nd

While the most frequently stated primary goal of the respondents was music for fun and enjoyment, the most frequently stated secondary goal of the same respondents was music for literacy and basic skills. The second most frequently stated primary goal of the respondents was music for appreciation and understanding, and the second most frequently stated secondary goal for the same respondents was performance skills. The differences between the first and second choices as primary goals are not very great; they are much greater for those chosen as secondary goals. As a matter of fact, the choice of literacy and basic skills in music was the most frequently recorded goal in any of the statements.

6. What is the relationship between the primary and the secondary goals?

Table A 7.1. This composite table regrouped the data from Tables A 5.1 and A 6.1. It was used as a basis for the analyses of both B 7.1 and B 7.2. This table shows that the same goals were expressed by some as primary and by others as secondary. (The goals of "music for fun, for love, for enjoyment, for appreciation" were expressed as primary by 70.03% and as secondary by 29.97%, for example. In relation to the goals expressed as "musical literacy, basic skills, performance skills," 27.31% stated these as primary while 72.69% stated them as secondary.)

Table B 7.1. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the secondary goals stated by the music educators. An inference can be drawn here that a higher proportion of the larger school districts profess goals of literacy and skills as secondary and also profess secondary goals as child-centered than do the smaller districts. In the overall picture it may also be seen that the majority of all the reporting districts, regardless of size, have stated literacy and skills as their secondary goal even though a breakdown shows that the smaller districts stress appreciation as a secondary goal more than do the larger districts (almost by a 2:1 ratio). The data do not indicate any correlation between district size and emphasis on social, ethnic, or other goals as secondary in elementary music education.

7. How are these goals reflected in the music program?

   The data for this question are not charted or treated to statistical evaluation. The answers were too few and too diverse. It is hoped that this question will be subjected to study at a later date.

8. Do the music educators think that they have innovational programs?

   Table A 8.1. This table charted the respondents who thought that they had an innovational program in music. At a confidence level of 95%, it can be stated that between 35% and 46% of the elementary school districts in the United States believe they have an innovational program.

   Table B 8.1. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a relationship between the size of the school district and the stated existence of an innovational program. An inference can be drawn here that the two middle-sized school districts had a smaller proportion of innovational programs than did either the larger or smaller districts when viewed from a relative standpoint. Both the smaller districts and the very large districts reported a relatively large number of innovational programs.

9. How many different ideas were expressed as innovational?

Table A 8.2. This table simply recorded the number of different ideas that the respondents called "innovational." The largest number of different ideas called innovational came from the "one-school" district, and the smallest number of different ideas called innovational came from the largest school districts (over 100 schools in the district), with a ratio of over 10:1. The answers to the second part of this question--"Is yours an innovational music program? If so, how?"--brought such a variety of expressions it is noteworthy to include them in this report; they do reflect the thinking of practicing music educators as to what an innovative program in music is:

One school in the district--reported the following terse ideas as indicative of innovation:

a. Ethnomusicology begins in grade five.

b. Each child has a chance to give demonstrations.

c. Each teacher has the freedom to develop her own program.

d. Has to be (innovational) ... because of facilities.

e. I started a complete program last year; (they) never had one before.

f. Making use of any new media.

g. We try to keep up with new methods and techniques and use them in the program.

h. Unusual experiences such as skipping rope to gain steadiness in beat.

i. Kodály.

j. Catchy songs, new methods of teaching.

k. We try anything.

l. Have used guitars and many outside items and relate to the idea trying to be taught.

m. Introducing "quality" music to a culturally-deprived town.

n. The students create the music.

o. Through our music enrichment.

p. Include rock--good and bad and what makes it good and bad.

q. New filmstrips; less emphasis on vocal.

r. Creativity in dealing with sounds around us.

s. We have audio lessons; music class over intercom to make up for not having enough teachers.

t. Originality and extended choral program.

u. Students encouraged to use bells, autoharps individually, to play accompaniments and to compose.

v. Students compose their own music; make instruments; relate today's world to that of yesterday.

w. Participation is emphasized.

x. We follow no text outline.

y. Diversity of materials.

z. Teacher and kids allowed to "create."

aa. Little use of the text.

bb. Individualization of instruction.

cc. Must adapt.

dd. New instruments for fifth and sixth.

ee. Correlation with art and physical education.

ff. Student planning.

Two schools in the district--reported the following:

a. We use different approaches.

b. Individual and class development.

c. New methods and new ideas (reported several times).

d. Emphasis on musical literacy and linguistically-based training program.

e. Use my own method, plus Kodály-Richards.

f. Use AV; individualized instruction to some extent.

g. Audio-visual; creative writing for grade three.

h. Orff-Schulwerk (reported several times).

Three schools in the district:

a. Experiences built around the children's creative ideas.

b. Using variety of materials.

c. Change when it benefits the children.

d. First year in this school system; using Orff-Kódaly.

e. All can participate.

f. Introducing Orff and Kodály.

g. New methods for this system presenting a wider range of experience.

h. New personnel.

i. Amateur hour once a week.

Four schools in the district:

a. Program fits the child.

b. Started reading charts, recorders, new listening series.

c. Orff-Richards charts. (Note: The Richards charts are Kodály, not Orff.)

d. All can participate.

e. Teacher encouraged to develop her own kind of program.

Five schools in the district:

a. Many colorful visual aids used with students; learning by doing.

b. Use of the keyboard.

c. Electronic laboratory in the middle schools (5, 6, 7).

d. Individual teachers.

e. Use of the recorders; use of some Manhattanville techniques.

f. Yes, ours is innovational; by teaching various music concepts.

g. Develop perceptual skills; music skills and interest.

Six to ten schools in the district:

a. Yes. Depends on the teacher in the school.

b. We often try out new ideas.

c. Use of learning centers for individualization.

d. Good music people.

e. TV instruction; tape recorders.

f. Use Orff instruments and recorders.

g. Kodály method.

h. Many teachers attend workshops and keep up with new developments.

i. Use of new methods and experiments.

j. Deviates from the text approach that was used in the past.

k. Individual experimentation on autoharp and bells.

l. Open enrollment policy in choral and instrumental groups.

m. We experiment.

n. Orff-Electronic Piano-Guitar.

o. All participate.

p. Change with current trends.

q. Extensive use of popular music for instruction.

r. Created it ourselves.

s. Teachers are free to create as their students require.

t. We teach various music concepts.

Eleven through twenty-five schools:

a. Orff-Electronic music.

b. Each school staff works with the music teacher to implement the program.

c. Compositional approach to theory.

d. Music TV.

e. Teachers trying various approaches.

f. Willing to try out new ideas.

g. Truly sound before sign.

h. Innovational with some teachers.

i. All new teachers are in-serviced with new techniques.

j. Our first program with traveling teachers.

k. Some teachers develop their own materials for instruments on current pop literature.

l. Some teachers use Manhattanville (three cases of this); some try Eurhythmics, and some Richards.

m. Use of pilot programs; in-service.

n. Use of Orff program (stated four times).

o. Orff-Kodály (also stated as combination several times).

p. Have exemplary program in one school only!

q. Exploratory concepts.

r. Non-graded music classes.

s. Offering some electronic music techniques in pilot program.

t. Strictly behavioral objectives.

u. My own course of study.

Twenty-six through fifty schools:

a. Using ukulele and electronic piano; class lessons which are innovative.

b. Orff-oriented.

c. Some Kodály; some Orff.

d. Project IMPACT and related arts.

e. Using guitar.

f. Teaching general reading through music.

g. Curriculum guidelines being developed along lines of behavioral objectives.

h. Excited teacher.

i. We use the best; the best of all new approaches and materials.

j. Some use Orff-Kodály, or Richards and Orff.

Fifty-one through one hundred schools:

a. Sing songs; music with program.

b. Through each teacher.

c. Special teachers; good equipment; comprehensive guide with manipulative activities; in-service.

d. Many schools trying different techniques; Kodály; Orff instruments.

e. Teachers may experiment with ideas which they have which are innovative.

Over one hundred schools:

a. In some situations, we have music laboratories.

b. Methods like Kodály; behavioral approach; behavioral objectives; creativity and innovative practices encouraged in a variety of ways.

c. Creativity stressed.

No comparative or statistical treatment was made for raw data, Table A 8.2. Listed were simply the number of different ideas that the respondents considered innovative. It was interesting to note how many more different ideas were stated as innovative on the part of one-school districts than in districts of other sizes. As stated previously, the ratio between the smallest and largest districts listed is 10:1.

10. Is the stated innovational program student-, teacher-, or subject-oriented?

Inevitably the problem became one of trying to find a common denominator, a way of classifying the material in order to give some picture of innovative practices currently in vogue. At Walden University (Florida), during the summer session held in 1972, the subject of innovational practices in education dominated several seminar sessions. The first general session broke down into levels of education, and the elementary level developed several subcommittees for study. The material of this research and its varied answers (as well as its expressions of "innovation") were studied with the recommendation that the material be classified according to basic orientation: student-, teacher-, or subject-oriented material. This brought about the organization of the material in Table A 8.3.

Table A 8.3. Of the 131 respondents that indicated they had an innovational program, six gave no reason why they considered their program innovative. But 80 (61+%) of the ideas could be classified as subject-oriented; 24 (18%) could be classified as teacher-oriented ideas; and only 21 (16%) could be classified as student-oriented ideas. Since contemporary developments in educational psychology are central to the nature of the present research, the factor of music programs being based primarily on the needs of the child is an important one.

Table B 8.3. The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the size of the school district and the kinds of statements made by the respondents concerning the innovational programs that they had. However, even though at a 95% confidence level there was found to be no relationship between the district size and types of programs, it is important to note that a majority of school districts, regardless of size, have subject-oriented innovational programs. It is also noteworthy that a higher percentage (24.53% versus 15.79%) of student-oriented programs and a lower percentage (13.21% versus 21.05%) of teacher-oriented programs occur in the smaller districts.

Again, in defense of the non-multiple-choice questionnaire, if a list of innovative programs had been used and respondents had been asked to check the one currently being utilized (or information of this description), ideas of what the practicing music educators considered "innovative" would not have been discerned. By avoiding direct suggestions or choices, it was discovered that an "innovative" program means many things to many music educators. During the 1960s there were important developments in the history of elementary music education (as well as other levels) with the allocation of funds from the federal ESEA acts; most of these grants were made on the basis of innovational study and innovative programs. The present study was very interested in knowing what music educators considered "innovational."

11. Do music educators state a need to "upgrade" their music programs?

Table A 9.1. This table charted the respondents' answers to the question on the upgrading of music programs. Considering the "yes," "no," and "no answer" tabulations, almost 80% of the respondents stated that they did need to upgrade their music programs. Only 7.90% stated that they did not need to upgrade their programs. This indicated that most of the music educators saw needs for change in their programs. From the answers tabulated it can be stated with 95% certainty that when only the "yes" or "no" answers are considered, the statement can be made that between 87.96% and 93.94% of all respondents in the elementary schools of the nation feel some need to "upgrade" their music programs.

Table B 9.1. The statistical analysis revealed that there definitely is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the statements of music educators as to whether they felt they should or should not upgrade their music programs. The data indicated that a higher percentage (95.00% versus 88.41%) of the larger districts (26 and more schools) feel they need to upgrade their programs than do the smaller districts. It is important to note that the vast majority of the total number of respondents felt the need to upgrade their programs.

12. In how many different ways was the need to "upgrade" expressed?

Table A 9.2. This table simply charted the total number of different ways stated by the respondents in their expressions of need to upgrade their music programs. By far the largest number of single ideas, with one exception, again came from the one-school district. The one exception was districts of six to ten schools which, of course, represented five different sized school districts. The one-school district expressed ten times as many ideas of how they wanted to upgrade their music programs as did the very largest districts of over 100 schools, yet not as many thought there was a need to "upgrade."

13. What recommendations do the music educators have for "upgrading" their music programs?

Table A 9.3. Most of the suggestions and recommendations of the respondents fell into ten possible classifications. These are organized in Table A 9.3 and indicate that by far the largest percentage of respondents feel that their need to upgrade the music program can be answered with more special music teachers. There was no statistical analysis for this table.

Questions Related to Financial Assistance for the Music Program[172]

1. Has there been a grant for music education?

Table A 10.1. Of the total number of respondents calculated for this question, the vast majority stated that they had no financial assistance for their music programs; 78.69% stated "no" financial help and 17.10% stated "yes," they had financial help.

---

[172] See Appendix C.

Table B 10.1. The statistical analysis revealed the fact that there is a very significant relationship between the size of the school district and the past existence of a grant for that district. In elementary music education it can be stated with 95% confidence that larger school districts receive more grants than do smaller ones at a ratio of about 4:1. Further, it can be stated that even at this rate, there are relatively few districts, regardless of size, that get grants of any description (state, federal, other).

2. What kind of grant has the district had?

Table A 10.2. This table charted the kinds of grants that the district reported: federal, state, or other. There was no statistical evaluation of this material, but relatively noted, over 65% of the respondents reporting grants stated they were federal grants; only 5% reported state grants for elementary music; and all other types of grants (county, city, organization, etc.) accounted for over 17% of those who stated they had grants.

3. Is the financially-assisted program still functioning?

Table A 10.3. Over 50% (56.52%) of those responding to this question stated that their program was still functioning; 33.33% stated their program was not functioning at the present time; and 10.14% of those who stated they had had financial assistance failed to answer "yes" or "no" to this question. The question was treated to statistical evaluation in terms of size of district with only those who answered "yes" or "no" considered.

Table B 10.3. The statistical evaluation revealed the fact that there is no significant relationship between the size of the school district and the continuing existence of a previously-bestowed grant. Even though at a 95% confidence level there was found to be no significant relationship, there are, nonetheless, two very interesting statements that can be made on the basis of the available data: First, that a smaller percentage (42.86%) of the smaller districts (one to three schools) were able to continue their formerly-funded music programs than the larger districts (26 and more schools), where 65.00% were able to continue--a difference of 22.14%; secondly, that when only the "yes" and "no" answers are tabulated, a majority of all districts responding report that they are able to continue the programs.

This information does not coincide with direct observation of elementary music classes in the state of California as noted by this investigator. Few districts and only particular classes where the teacher had taken special training were observed continuing the program one year after cutoffs. This included districts where special Orff instructors were hired for the project or special professional concerts were arranged for the schools. However, it must also be stated that districts like Bellflower United School District have been able to retain more of the program than others observed. In a letter to this investigator from Bellflower Superintendent W. Norman Wampler (dated

January 12, 1970), the answer to the question about the extent to which the program was able to continue came as follows:

> It has continued in a number of ways. One of the most promising is the establishment of courses at several major universities in the ... field of Orff-Schulwerk. Some of these are of the extension variety; others are on campus.... Two of the districts involved in the project have employed full-time Orff-Schulwerk teachers to carry on training. A number of teachers trained in the project have developed sufficient competency that they are continuing in the activity in their own classes.

In 1969 Norman E. Hearn had reported that 85% of the 330 (all fields) innovative programs from Title III of the ESEA had survived and were still operating after fund cutoffs more than a year before.[173] With further discussion on this point Hearn acknowledged a much lower survival rate in music. In May, 1972, he stated:

> The law's requirement for objective data on achievement has tended to cause schools to develop projects in more readily measurable activities, such as reading. Many Title I and Title III projects, however, do contain music programs.[174]

4. Why is the program not functioning today?

   Table A 10.4. This table charted the few answers to the question that attempted to discover the handicaps in continuing state and federally-funded projects. etc. Answers were too scant for statistical evaluation but most of those who did respond to this question stated that funds were discontinued by the government, and no replacement was found. Other answers (also few) indicated that money had now been allotted to other areas or that they no longer qualified for the funds.

---

[173] Norman E. Hearn, op. cit.

[174] Norman E. Hearn, Coordinator, Educational Communication and Change Strategies, in a letter to the investigator, dated May 1, 1972.

5. Is there a need for financial assistance for the present music program?

Table A 11.1. This table charted the raw data of 449 respondents regarding their need or lack of need for financial assistance for their music programs. Fifty-three of the respondents did not answer the question at all, but 290 stated they did need financial help as against 106 who stated that they did not.

Table B 11.1. This table reorganized the data for statistical evaluation. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the need for financial assistance. At a confidence level of 95%, it can be stated that between 68.74% and 77.72% of the school districts in the United States have some need for financial assistance for their music programs. Further, it can be seen from the data that a higher percentage of the largest districts (92.68%) desire financial aid than do the smallest districts (65.00%). The larger the district, the more the need for financial aid was stated. As a whole it is noteworthy that 73.23% of all the responding districts indicated a need for financial assistance for music.

6. How would the music educators use the financial assistance if they now had it?

Table A 11.2. By far the largest majority of the respondents' expressions of where they would spend the money if they had it fell into two categories: for musical materials and for music personnel. All the other responses were relatively few in comparison, but were nonetheless tabulated.

Table B 11.2. The statistical analysis revealed that there is no relationship between the size of the district and the manner in which appropriated monies would be used by music educators. While this relationship may not be significant at a 95% confidence level, there were some important trends evidenced by the responses: Both the very smallest and the very largest districts would put their money into musical equipment first and personnel second; in the overall analysis of all sizes of districts, the reverse has a slightly higher percentage. Considering all districts, between 34.13% and 44.61% of the respondents stated that any grant money that they could get would be used for music personnel.

Questions Related to the Music Teacher in the Elementary Classroom[175]

1. Who actually teaches the elementary music in the classroom?

Table A 12.1. This table charted the raw data in answer to specific listing: The regular classroom teacher? A music specialist? A music supervisor? A music coordinator? Over half of the respondents indicated that a music specialist taught some "classroom music"; over one-third indicated the regular classroom teacher taught the classroom music. Very small percentages were recorded for the others.

---

[175] See Appendix D.

Table B 12.1. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and "who" teaches the classroom music, i.e., the classroom teacher, the music supervisor, the music coordinator, or a special music teacher. In the sample there were three times as many school districts employing music specialists in the smaller categories of districts than those using the regular classroom teacher for music; in the larger districts, there were four times as many districts using the classroom teacher for music as those using the music specialist. It would have been expected that the many small districts would not have had music specialists, but would have been completely dependent upon the classroom teacher. The facts revealed virtually the opposite even though in many small districts it was often stated that one specialist had to cover several school districts and was sometimes employed by more than one district or by an organization especially set up to employ specialists for a number of districts. Furthermore, not only does the percentage of music specialists decrease proportionately as the districts grow larger, but precisely the inverse ratio can be seen if the data are interpreted from the standpoint of the classroom teacher as music instructor. At a 95% confidence level, it can be stated that between 34.40% and 43.83% of the districts nationwide use classroom teachers for music instruction.

2. Who helps the general classroom teacher who teaches her

own music?

Table A 12.2. Where the classroom teacher teaches her own music, respondents report that 44.44% get help from a music specialist, and 32.63% report that they get no help at all.

Table B 12.2. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the help that the classroom teacher (who teaches music herself) gets from music specialists. Larger districts report more help available for the classroom teacher who teaches her own music than do smaller districts. As a matter of fact, the smallest school districts (one to three schools) reported no help at all in 54.29% of their districts.

The data in the present study should not be confused with that of the National Education Association, done in 1961-62. The latter concerned the individual teacher in the elementary classroom who did or did not get help to teach music and the percentage of elementary music teachers who were music specialists.[176] The present study concerns entire districts, sometimes with schools numbering over 100 (in one case, 200 schools), sometimes whole districts with only one school. While a comparison can be made between the percentage of teachers getting help or no help on a one-to-one basis, no camparison can be made, for example, on a nationwide basis. In the 1962 study it was found that of all elementary music instructors, 40% were classroom teachers who had help from music specialists; fewer were classroom teachers who had no help;

---

[176] Reported in Chapter II of this study.

and only 20% were music specialists. Now, in 1972, similar figures can be reported from this study: On a one-to-one basis, i.e., where there is one teacher in the school (and the school district), there are still relatively few classroom teachers (teaching music) who get help from the music specialist. In this case not 40% but 24% get help, and 44% (instead of less than 40%) get no help at all. From the data gathered in this study it cannot be stated that 20% (or any other percentage) of all elementary music teachers are music specialists, but it can be stated that in the larger districts of 26 and more schools in the district (including the "over 100" districts), less than 20% of the districts' music teachers are music specialists. Furthermore, it can be repeated that at a 95% confidence level, between 34.40% and 43.83% of the districts nationwide use classroom teachers for their music instruction. These figures can be interpreted to indicate that the situation has not changed dramatically for the better since the 1962 study, but that, on the contrary, the figures lead to the conclusion that a decline is evident.

Questions Related to Music Instruction in the Elementary Schools[177]

1. How much time is allotted for general elementary classroom music?

   Table A 13.1. This table simply charted those responses that were not specific as to the amount of time allotted for general classroom music. Such general answers as "frequencies vary," "private lessons only," etc., appear in this chart.

---

[177] See Appendix E.

Table A 13.2. This table charted the specific time reported for music in the classroom on a weekly basis. Approximately one-third of the districts reported that they had classroom music twice a week. Almost as high a percentage was reported by those who stated that their classes were held once a week. In each case the number of minutes devoted to each class meeting ranged from 20 minutes to 45 minutes (once a week) or 60 minutes (twice a week), but there were very few cases in the longer time span.

TABLE 6

Allotted Time and Frequency for Elementary Classroom Music

Instruction	Range of time per session	Percentage of respondents
Twice monthly	30 minutes	1.10%
Once weekly	20 to 45 minutes	30.77%
Twice weekly	20 to 60 minutes (some more)	38.22%
Three times weekly	20 to 60 minutes (some more)	11.35%
Four times weekly	20 to 40 minutes	3.60%
Daily	15 to 40 minutes	11.91%
Other	no time stated	3.04%

Table A 13.3. This table reorganized the raw data so that the time spans were the bases for comparison. It was found that the largest percentage of districts reported between 20 and 40 minutes being spent in classroom music weekly (39.02%). The second largest percentage of districts reported that they spent between 45 and 65 minutes in classroom music weekly (30.92%). From 70 to 90 minutes weekly was reported by only 15.61% of the districts, and over 95 minutes per week was reported by 14.45% of the districts.

Table B 13.3. The statistical analysis revealed the fact that at a 95% confidence level, there is no significant relationship between the size of the school district and the number of minutes classroom music is taught per week. It is interesting to report, however, that when the data were compiled for statistical analysis, over one-third of all the respondents still showed that music is only offered in the classroom from 20 to 40 minutes weekly. In other words, although Table 6 shows that 38.22% of the districts report allotting music time twice a week from 20 to 60 minutes, only one district was listed in the 60 minute time slot, etc.

The findings of this study do not indicate that the MENC recommendation of July, 1972 (that a minimum of 90 minutes of music time should be allotted weekly for elementary music education), is in general practice today. From the data and the statistical analysis it can be reported that 39.02% of the districts report that they spend between 20 and 40 minutes weekly in classroom music; lesser amounts of time are recorded for others. Less than 15% of the districts reported that they spent 95 or more minutes in elementary classroom music. This would seem to be a very important finding that should be restudied for confirmation. If this finding is true, then the recommendation of the MENC has had little impact on actual practice.

2. What basic textbooks are being used to teach classroom music? Table A 14.1. This table recorded the first-named textbook stated as being used to teach the elementary classroom music. Some districts reported using several texts, and much supplementary material was listed. In a later tabulation the material was treated to an analysis of the relationship of text to primary goals, but in this particular tabulation only the first-named text was used. The largest number of districts, over one-fourth of those responding, stated that they were using the Silver Burdett Making Music Your Own (first-named text); the second largest reported text as far as popularity was concerned was the Holt, Rinehart, and Winston Exploring Music. There were nine basic texts listed by the respondents, over 15% of whom also reported that they used several or many texts, and over 19% of whom made no statements at all concerning what text they were using. At a confidence level of 95%, it is safe to report the following texts in relation to their utility in the schools of the United States:

Title of the Text	Percentage of Districts Using This Text
DMT Discovering Music Together (Follett)	between 3.018% and 8.829%
EM Exploring Music (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston)	between 14.436% and 23.892%
GM Growing with Music (Prentice-Hall)	between 1.437% and 6.228%
MM Magic of Music (Ginn and Company)	between 3.0% and 7.0%
MMYO Making Music Your Own (Silver Burdett)	between 28.151% and 39.445%
MYA Music for Young Americans (American Book Company)	between 3.849% and 10.089%
TIM This Is Music (Allyn and Bacon)	between 1.691% and 6.671%
All other texts	between 0.540% and 3.430%

No other analysis was done on this material. The above calculations differ only slightly from the raw data chart since the proportional analysis did not include those who did not answer the question at all but accounted only for those who did answer.

3. Are correlated recordings being provided for the texts?

Table A 15.1. This table charted those schools that did (or did not) provide correlated recordings for the texts. Of the 445 responses checked on this point, over 67% said "yes," that recordings were provided that correlated with the texts used.

Table B 15.1. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the provision of correlated recordings for the texts used in elementary classroom music. The data reveal, however, that the smaller districts have a smaller percentage of correlated recordings provided than do the larger districts. There is a difference of over 16% between the smallest districts (one to three schools) and even the medium-sized districts (11 to 25 schools). The data show that the larger the district, the more frequently correlated recordings are made available.

4. Are audio-visual materials being provided?

Table A 15.2. This table charted the raw data regarding the audio-visual materials being provided by the districts. Of the total number of respondents, over 31% did not answer this question at all; almost 42% stated they did have audio-visual materials; and about 15% stated that AV materials were not available to them. (About 12% reported "some" materials available.) No statistical evaluation was tabulated on this raw data for there were too many small entries, especially for the larger districts. It might be noted, however, that when the "no answer" column is excluded, approximately 78% had at least some audio-visual materials.

5. Is music reading taught in the general elementary music

classroom?

Table A 16.1. This table charted the responses of the respondents in terms of a simple "yes," "no," or "no answer." Over 82% of the respondents stated that they do teach music reading; only 11% stated that they do not teach it; and 6% gave no answer at all to this question. It is significant to the present research that over 80% of the elementary districts in the nation reported that they do teach music reading. (To discover to what extent elementary children can read music would extend the inquiry to an area of future research.)

Table B 16.1. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the teaching of music reading in classroom music. According to the respondents a higher percentage of the larger districts state they teach music than do the smaller districts. As a matter of fact, the percentage gradually increases from the smallest districts (82.32%) to the middle groups (91.73% and 90.32%) and to the largest groups (95.24%). It can also be stated at a 95% confidence level that between 84.54% and 91.05% of the districts nationwide state that they teach music reading in the classroom; inversely, between 8.94% and 15.45% of the school districts report that they do not teach music reading in the classroom.

6. By what method do the music educators state that they teach music reading?

Table A 16.2. This table charted the number of different ideas that were used to express "by what method" music reading was taught. There were 287 responses to this part of the question on music reading. Seven identifiable and different ideas were expressed as method. It was interesting to note that the largest number of responses stated that they used Kodály, Richards, or a combination of the two. "Rote to note" was the second largest reported method, with "moveable do" and syllables next. Instruments were reported, with numbers and letters at about the same frequency. A number of statements were made that did not fit any method. No valid statistical data could be presented as a result of this chart since there was such a wide range of response indicative of the absence of any nationwide standard or nationwide trend. Many categories received only one response from the respondents yet had to be accounted for. Other than the Kodály-Richards combination, the next largest category was actually the non-descript column.

7. In what grade does music reading in the classroom begin? Table A 17.1. This table charted the answers to the question as to when the districts begin the teaching of music reading, and every single grade level from K through sixth was cited. Approximately 9% did not answer the question at all, and almost one-third of the respondents indicated that they began music reading in the first grade. The next highest number responded "second grade." In order of frequency of grade for the starting of music reading, the data fell in this order:

Grade 1: 42.93%; Grade 2: 20.66%; Grade 3: 15.57%;
Grade 4: 11.98%; Kindergarten: 5.39%; Grade 5: 2.99%;
Grade 6: 1.20%

Table B 17.1. The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the size of the school district and the grade selected for starting the music reading in the classroom. In this chart kindergarten and first grade were combined and indicate the largest percentage of respondents. Of particular interest is the fact that the tendency to start at the fourth grade level or later is greatest in the smaller district and diminishes as the size of the district grows larger.

8. How often is music reading taught in the classroom?

Table A 17.2. This table charts the raw data on a weekly basis as reported by the respondents. Over one-third of the respondents did not answer the question at all. The largest number of those who did indicated that the class was taught twice a week. But the third largest group stated that the time varies.

Table B 17.2. The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the size of the school district and how frequently music reading is taught each week in the classroom. It is noteworthy that about the same proportion of small as large districts report teaching music reading once a week.

9. Is instrumental training taught in the public schools?

Table A 18.1. This table charted the raw data regarding instruction on musical instruments in the public schools of the nation. Very few of the respondents failed to answer this question; the overwhelming majority stated that they did teach instruments in the schools.

Table B 18.1. The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the size of the district and the existence of instrumental training classes. It can be stated, however, that at a 95% confidence level, between 81.79% and 88.65% of the districts state that they do have an instrumental training program; between 11.34% and 18.20% do not.

10. At what grade level do the respondents state that instrumental training begins in the schools?

Table A 18.2. There were 375 responses to this question. Very few stated that instrumental training began as early as the second grade (1.33%) or the third grade (5.33%). The largest number of respondents stated that they started their instrumental training program in either the fourth grade (46.13%) or the fifth grade (37.87%). Over 9% stated that they started their programs as late as the sixth grade. This table was not treated statistically because it failed to satisfy the conditions for valid analysis stated earlier (low frequency of responses in some of the grades).

11. Is there a plan to have different instruments taught in different grades?

Table A 18.3. There were 372 responses to this question, of which 98 (26.34%) answered "yes" and 198 (53.23%) answered "no." The rest did not answer at all. This meant that despite the fact that 20% did not answer this part of the question at all, over 50% of the respondents indicated that they did not teach different instruments at different grades.

Table B 18.3. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and a plan or program whereby different instruments are started in different grades. An inference can be drawn here to the effect that a higher proportion of the larger districts have a plan for starting instruction on different instruments at different grades than do the smaller districts. The data indicate that the smaller districts do not have as great a tendency to start different instruments at different grades, and this could be simply because of numbers or limitations imposed due to size. The district composed of 11 to 25 schools was the only one to indicate that more than 50% do have a plan whereby the instruments are begun in different grades.

12. When are the different instruments begun in the training program?

Table A 18.4. Many respondents stated specifically when they began which instruments. This data is charted in A 18.4. The largest number indicated they started their strings in the fourth grade and their brass and woodwinds in the fifth grade. Many separated the information. Percentages were as follows:

	Highest percentage start in:	Second highest percentage start in:
Strings	Grade 4 (69.76%)	Grade 3 (18.60%)
Woodwinds	Grade 5 (81.39%)	Grade 4 (19.14%)
Brass	Grade 5 (73.33%)	Grade 4 (15.55%)

No valid analysis could be made of these data because of the small number of responses in varying categories.

13. How are the instruments selected?

Table A 18.5. A few respondents indicated different ways in which decisions were made as to when or how the instruments were decided upon. This information is simply recorded here as raw data and is not studied further.

14. What methods are used to teach instrumental training in the public schools of the nation?

Table A 19.1. Here the raw data listing the number of methods were charted. So few answered this question that it could not be subjected to statistical analysis. It is evident, however, that Suzuki is only mentioned by the larger districts and then only infrequently; Belwin was the most frequently named.

15. Who teaches the instrumental training classes?

Table A 19.2. This table charted the raw data from the responses into three classifications: respondents that did not answer at all, those that stated an instrumental specialist taught the classes, and those claiming that a vocal specialist taught the classes. (Over 80% are taught by instrumental specialists, but a very small percentage--3.32%--did state that the vocal specialists also taught the instruments.) No statistical evaluation was made of these data.

16. What is the length of the lessons and/or how frequently are the lessons given?

Table A 19.3. This table converted the information given in the two parts of the question related to length of the lessons and frequency of the lessons: all of the data were converted into hours per week. A proportional analysis was done on the data as reported in Table 7.

TABLE 7

Weekly Time Reported for Instrumental Training Classes

Weekly hours reported	Proportional analysis of school districts
1/2 hour	between 29% and 39%
3/4 hour	between 6% and 12%
1 hour	between 30% and 40%
1 1/2 hours	between 5% and 9%
2 hours	between 5% and 9%
3 hours	between 2% and 6%
4 hours	between 0% and 5%
5 hours	between 1% and 4%

Table B 19.3. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the amount of time devoted to instrumental training. Both the very smallest and the very largest districts devote more time to instrumental training than do the medium-sized districts. By far the largest amount of time is spent in the very smallest districts. Overall the greatest number of respondents for all size districts (41.72%) indicated that they gave only one-half hour per week for instrumental training.

17. Is there a special string program in the elementary schools of the nation?

Table A 20.1. This table charted the raw data of the "yes," "no," and "no answer" responses. Only 32.21% of those responding stated that they had a special string program. Over 54% stated that they did not.

Table B 20.1. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a very high relationship between the size of the school district and the existence of a string program in the district. The form this strong relationship takes is revealed very explicitly in the data: as the size of the school district increases, the percentage of respondents indicating string programs increases. One to three schools recorded only 7.27%; four to ten schools, 44.00%; 11-25 schools, 70.69%; and districts with 26 schools and over, 90.00%. Notwithstanding the strength of the relationship, only 37.11% of those responding "yes" or "no" indicate there is a string program at all. In fact, it can be stated with 95% confidence that only between 32.17% and 42.04% of the elementary schools of the nation teach the strings in the elementary schools.

18. Who teaches the string instruments in the public schools?

Table A 20.2. This table charted the raw data of 141 responses to this question. Over 67% of the respondents reported that the program was taught by a string specialist, while only two cases (00.71%) were reported where the "band man" was listed as teaching the strings. However, almost 32% reported that "other" teachers taught the strings. These were variously listed as: vocal teacher, pianist, guitar teacher, etc. These data did not lend themselves to statistical analysis.

19. When are the string instruments taught in the public elementary schools?

Table A 20.3. This question was directed to information desired regarding "after school" instrumental programs. In terms of the total number of respondents, only 12.13% indicated that the string class took place during school time. Two respondents stated that the class took place after school, and others indicated the class took place at other times, such as noon, weekends, etc. Proportional analysis was done on those few who did indicate when their string class took place. Of the respondents who indicated specifically "when," between 40.52% and 60.40% stated that their string program goes on during school time, while between 39.59% and 59.47% of these same music educators indicate that their string program goes on at other times.

20. Is there an elementary school orchestra in the public schools?

Table A 20.4. A proportional analysis revealed that only between 29.67% and 40.18% of the school districts report that they have an elementary school orchestra. Between 59.82% and 70.32% of the districts report that they have no elementary school orchestra.

Table B 20.4. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a very significant relationship between the size of the school district and the existence of an elementary school orchestra. The inference can be drawn here that only about one-tenth of the smaller districts report they have an elementary school orchestra, while the largest school districts report that about two-thirds of their districts do have elementary school orchestras.

21. How does the number of elementary orchestras compare with the number of bands in the elementary schools?

Table A 20.5. This table simply charted the raw data on the existence of bands in elementary schools for an approximate comparison. Of the total of 447 responses, elementary bands were almost two and one-half times more frequently reported than elementary orchestras. Further, while there are far fewer orchestras in the smaller districts than in the larger districts (percentage-wise), the contrary is true in the case of bands, where over 85% of the smallest districts state that they do have a band.

22. How extensive is the existence of the elementary band?

Table A 21.1. From the raw data it can be seen that a great majority of the school districts in the United States report the existence of an elementary band.

Table B 21.1. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the existence of an elementary band. From the data it can be observed that a higher percentage of the small districts had an elementary band than the largest districts. Furthermore, with the exception of the "11-25 schools" category, the percentage decreases as the size of the school district increases, and the difference between the percentage of the "11-25 schools" and the "26 and over schools" is so small as to not negate the statement regarding the trend. The dominating answer of all the districts that answered "yes" to the question regarding the existence of an elementary school band was 78.90%, indicating a sizeable majority. At a 95% confidence level, it can be stated that between 74.45% and 83.34% of all elementary school districts in the nation have elementary bands.

23. How often does the elementary band rehearse?

Table A 21.2. This table charted the raw data concerning the frequency of rehearsals for the elementary band. Of the 253 responses to this question, it was found that the largest group rehearsed weekly (when three categories of weekly, twice weekly, and more than twice weekly were considered). When the data were compiled for statistical analysis as indicated by the next table, two categories resulted in the largest group's being those that rehearsed two or more times per week.

Table B 21.2. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the frequency with which band rehearsals occur. The smallest districts rehearse almost twice as frequently as the largest districts. In the overall picture, 58.89% of the districts reported that they rehearsed two or more times per week.

24. How often does the elementary band appear in public performance?

Table A 21.3. This table charted those respondents who stated that their bands made public appearances at least two times per year and those that stated their bands made public appearances more frequently. By far the largest number reported that their bands appeared twice a year.

Table B 21.3. The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the size of the school district and the frequency with which the band appears in public. However, the great majority of the respondents (80.16%) did indicate that their bands performed twice a year. At a 95% confidence level, it can be stated that only between 14.71% and 24.94% of all the school districts have public appearances made by the elementary band at least three times a year, while between 75.92% and 85.04% of the bands perform twice a year in public.

25. Is there a special choral program in the elementary school?

Table A 22.1. This table charted the raw data on the existence of a choral program in the elementary schools. Of the 446 respondents on the choral questions (including those who did not respond to this phase of the question), over 50% indicated that they did have a special choral program.

Table B 22.1. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the existence of an elementary choral program. The inference can be drawn here to the effect that the larger school districts have a higher proportion of choral programs than do the smaller school districts. Furthermore, there is also indicated a significant trend from smallest to largest districts, going from 47.83% (one to three schools), to 71.43% (largest districts). Overall, 58.45% of the districts do have a choral program and at a confidence level of 95%, it may be stated that between 53.52% and 63.10% of all elementary schools in the nation do have elementary choral programs.

26. What grades participate in the elementary choral program?

Table A 22.2. This table charted the raw data and gave the surprising information that grades all the way from kindergarten through sixth were listed. Fourth, fifth, and sixth grades had the highest percentages.

Table B 22.2. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the grades that participate in the elementary choral program. The data indicate that a higher percentage of the smallest districts (one to three schools) include grades K through 3 in their choral programs (33.33%), while the larger districts report very small percentages that include the primary grades. As a matter of fact, most of the larger districts include grades four, five, and six, with five and six having the largest percentage (48.79%). This indicated that the larger districts do not start their choral programs in the elementary schools as early as do the smaller districts.

27. Does the elementary choral group appear in public performance?

Table A 22.3. This table charted the raw data and indicated that only one out of all the 249 respondents (on this question) stated that the chorus did not appear in public. There was no need for further analysis.

28. How often does the elementary chorus appear in public?

Table A 22.4. This table charted the respondents' answers to the question of frequency of appearance of the chorus in the elementary school. The answers: from one time a year to more than eight times a year, with some stating that it varies. The largest percentages (45.42%) were recorded for those who reported that their choral groups performed in public twice a year.

Table B 22.4. The data from A 22.4 were reorganized for statistical evaluation into three categories: annually or semi-annually, three or four times a year, and more than four times a year. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the frequency with which the elementary chorus appears in public performance. The largest percentage of annual or semi-annual public appearances was found in the smallest districts (62.79%); the largest percentage of districts presenting their choral groups more than four times a year was found in the largest districts (40.00%). However, in the overall picture, over 50% (59.84%) stated that their choral groups made public performances once or twice a year.

The next group of charts and tables are related to the stated primary goals of the music educators in an attempt to discover whether there is any relationship between the goals reported by the respondents and the existence of a music reading program, an instrumental training program, a string program, use of a particular textbook, etc. Since the goals had been previously organized into 11 categories in the initial treatment of the raw data and were then combined to express four basic ideas for statistical analysis, it would be of value to restate the 11 categories and then explain the combinations before presenting the statistical analysis. The 11 categories that were originally expressed by the respondents in their statements of primary goals are as follows:[178]

A	Fun; Enjoyment with music
B	Development of "love" of music

---

[178] See Appendix B, Table A 5.1.

C Appreciation; Understanding in music

D Participation and involvement in music

E Literacy in music; Development of basic skills

F Performance skills in music; Instrumental and vocal training

G Creative development in music

H Development of each child's musical interest; Music for every child

I Self-realization; Individual instruction

J Multi-ethnic; Cultural heritage; Social

K All other primary goals stated including integration with other subjects, "reaching" as many children as possible, "rounding out" the education, learning to work together, seeking out the talents in music, etc.

As stated previously, these 11 primary goals were reorganized and combined in order to be treated statistically. At first the reorganization combined those categories with common factors and developed five categories as follows:[179]

I A, B, C, and D of the above goals as expressive of the less subject matter, more enjoyment and general appreciation type of goals

II E, F, and G of the above goals as expressive of the more subject matter, more literacy and skill type of goal

III H and I of the above goals as expressive of the more child-centered, individual child interest type of direction in goals

---

[179] See Appendix B, Tables A 7.1 and B 7.1.

IV J only as expressive of the more cultural, social, and ethnic interest type of goal

V K only as expressive of all other miscellaneous expressions of primary goal

This latter combination was then to be further combined in order to meet statistical requirements for the analysis that is reported in all B charts and tables (all cells less than five ... etc.). The last combination used in the following statistical evaluation developed the following:

I A, B, C, and D goals as stated above

II E, F, and G as stated above

III H and I as stated above

IV J and K together, now being classified as all other goals

In the case of factors which could not be combined, such as the specific textbooks listed or the particular music specialist cited (supervisor, coordinator, etc.), there was no attempt made at statistical evaluation, and only the raw data are presented in the A charts and tables.

Questions Regarding Primary Goals as Related to Other Factors[180]

1. Are the primary goals related to the selected texts?

   Table A 23,1. This table charted the respondents' statements of their primary goals against the series or texts (not just the "first-named" text) used in the classroom in an attempt to discover if there was any relationship between the aims or goals of the music program and the particular text or texts utilized. Although no statistical analysis was made for these data, a basic comparison follows:

---

[180] See Appendix F.

Goals	Most frequently stated text
A	MMYO (Silver Burdett)
B	MMYO
C	MMYO
D	MMYO
E	MMYO
F	MMYO and DMT (Follett) same percentage
G	EM (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston)
H	MMYO
I	MMYO
J	MMYO
K	MMYO and DMT

2. Is there a relationship between the stated primary goals and "who" teaches the classroom music?

Table A 24.1. This table charted the raw data of classroom teacher as general elementary teacher of music against the stated primary goals. The data are divided into these categories of response: those that stated the classroom teacher teaches the genral music class part of the time; those that stated that only the classroom teacher taught the general elementary music; and those that stated the classroom teacher did not teach the class at all.

Table B 24.1. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the stated primary goal and whether the classroom teacher only teaches the music class, or if the classroom teacher teaches it some of the time, or not at all. Over 57% of those whose goals were expressive of enjoyment, pleasure, less subject matter, etc., were not taught by the classroom teacher, and over 74% of those whose goals were directed at greater literacy were also not taught by the classroom teacher. When the classroom teacher only is responsible for the classroom music in the elementary school, the most frequently stated goal is the child-centered or individualization goal. When the classroom teacher teaches elementary music part of the time, the most frequently stated goal is the same--child-centered--but the second most frequently stated goal is that expressive of less subject matter and more enjoyment and appreciation.

3. Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals and classroom music taught by the special music teacher?
4. Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals and classroom music taught by a music supervisor?
5. Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals and classroom music taught by a music coordinator?
6. Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals and classroom music when no answer was given or another music educator was named?

Tables A 24.2 through A 24.5. These tables present raw data only and were not treated to statistical analysis. There were a number of responses in each category which were so small that no valid analysis could be done. A few observations can be made, however. Regardless of goal, neither the music supervisor nor the music coordinator does much actual teaching. Where there is a special music teacher assigned to classroom music, she most frequently teaches the class without help from the classroom teacher. Regardless of stated goal, 93.60% of the districts did not use the music supervisor for classroom music nor did 93.22% of the districts use their music coordinator.

7. Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals and the teaching of music reading?

   Table A 25.1. This table charted the raw data of stated primary goals against the teaching of music reading. Most frequently stated as a goal by those who report they do teach music reading was Goal C (music for appreciation); the second most frequently stated was Goal A (music for fun and enjoyment). Table B 25.1. The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the stated primary goals and the fact that music reading was or was not taught. When only "yes" or "no" answers are calculated, the data reveal that over 90% state they do teach music reading.

8. Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals and the methods by which music reading is taught?

   Table A 25.2. Only the raw data (tabulating goals against method) were charted here. No statistical analysis could be made on these data, but some observations can be stated.

The "fixed do" method, as stated by two respondents, fell in Goals C and E (which can be considered very dissimilar as primary goals); the Kodály-Richards method most frequently recorded Goal C as primary; and the "moveable do" method had the same number of responses for Goal C as for Goal D.

9. Is there a relationship between the stated primary goals and the existence of an instrumental training program?

Table A 26.1. This table charted the raw data and showed that an overwhelming majority of the respondents state that instrumental training is taught, and that Goals A, C, D, and E are the most frequently reported. However, when goals are combined for statistical evaluation, the stress changes slightly.

Table B 26.1. The statistical data revealed that there is no significant relationship between the stated primary goals and the existence of an instrumental training program. It is interesting to note that each of the goals (I, II, III, and IV) stated as primary drew over an 80% response from those who claimed that they had an instrumental training program.

10. Is there a relationship between the stated primary goals and the grade level at which the instrumental training program begins?

Table A 26.2. This table charted the raw data of the 11 stated goals against the grade level at which the respondents stated they began their instrumental training programs. Goals for those who began in the very early grades (two and three) were not frequently reported, but grades four, five, and six most frequently stated Goal A. The data were reorganized in the next table for statistical evaluation.

Table B 26.2. The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the stated primary goals and the grade level at which the instrumental training program begins.

11. Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals and the plan to offer different instruments (for training) at different grades?

Table A 26.3. This table charted the raw data of primary goals against the concept of teaching the different instruments at different grades, i.e., beginning the strings earlier, the woodwinds and brass later.

Table B 26.3. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the stated primary goals and the plan to offer different instruments in different grades. A higher proportion of those who stated their goals in the I category (A-B-C-D) say "yes," that their instrumental training program offers different instruments at different grade levels. These are the music educators whose primary goals are not literacy and skills but rather are those of enjoyment, appreciation, participation, etc. The highest percentage of those who say "no," that they do not offer different instruments in different grades state their primary goals as IV (J-K), i.e., cultural heritage combined with other infrequently chosen goals.

12. Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals and the grade plan for starting instrumental training?

    Table A 26.4. This table charted the raw data of the stated primary goals against the grade level at which the instruments were offered. The material did not lend itself to statistical analysis.

13. Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals and the existence of a string program in the elementary schools?

    Table A 27.1. This table charted the raw data of the stated primary goals against the existence of a special string program. Most of the districts report that they do not have a string program, but the primary goals were combined for statistical evaluation.

    Table B 27.1. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the stated primary goals of the music educators and the existence of a string program. The greatest strength lies in Goals III (H-I), where 50% have a a string program and report goals directed toward the individual child and self-realization, and the other 50% chose the same goals but do not offer a string program. That 50% who reported child-oriented goals as primary represents the largest percentage of those who state they do offer a string program.

14. Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals and "who" teaches the string program?

    Table A 27.2. This table charted the raw data of the 11 basic goals against the string specialist, the general instrumental teacher, and the band specialist. The string specialist is most frequently stated as the string teacher, but the general instrumentalist is not far behind. A large majority of those stating string specialists also state Goals IV (J-K) as their primary goals.

Table B 27.2. The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the stated primary goals and the person who teaches the string program. Goals IV (J-K) are stated as the primary goals for 80% of those stating string specialist while primary goals of the respondents stating general instrumental specialist are II (E-F-G) or those goals of literacy, performance, and creative development. Less than 20% of the districts use a nonspecialist in the string program; among these, the most frequently stated primary goals are III (H-I), the child-oriented goals.

15. Is there a relationship between the stated primary goals and the existence of an elementary orchestra in the music program?

Table A 27.3. This table charted the 11 basic goals against the existence of an elementary orchestra in the schools. Twice as many districts reported no orchestras as reported orchestras. Goal A was the most frequently reported for these.

Table B 27.3. The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the existence of an orchestra in the elementary school and the stated primary goals of the music program. Most of those music educators who have orchestras in the elementary schools seem to state III (H-I), child-oriented goals, as their primary goals.

Interviews with Elementary Administrators

All of the administrators who were interviewed were candidates for the Ph. D. or the Ed. D. and were in residence at the University of Walden's Institute for Advanced Studies in Education at Naples, Florida, during the summer of 1972. The administrators were not selected by any particular method. Some administrators, as acquaintances developed, were asked individually if they would grant an interview. Some volunteered when at class sessions the instructor gave permission to the investigator to report on the project and ask for volunteers. In all, 27 interviews took place.

On the basis of a thesis statement developed by the investigator, a question sheet was developed. The purpose of this sheet was to make the interviews and the basic questions as identical as possible and to economize on time. The question sheet (and its thesis statement) were revised, then approved by Dr. Harold Hodgkinson, the investigator's advisor.

The question sheet sought routine data of geographic region, administrative post, responsibilities, etc., and sought opinion of the administrators with regard to agreement or disagreement with the investigator's thesis statement. It also sought knowledge from the administrators with regard to their problems in elementary music education and opinions from the administrators with regard to what could be done to bring music education--quantitive and qualitive--into the general elementary classroom. A direction for response was posed: "Your opinion of problems and how we can resolve them will be deeply appreciated. Please use reverse, if you wish, for further comments."[181]

Discussion took place frequently and freely at the interviews. Pertinent comments were entered immediately on the question sheet. Most of the administrators appeared very knowledgeable in elementary music education and most were quite vocal about their particular problems. Several spoke of outstanding music programs and expressed pride in their own music education developments. Others indicated concern for declining music programs and stated the reasons they felt were responsible for such.

Results of the Interviews

The interviews were first classified according to the administrator's region of the United States. (Although the question asked for district, city, and state, the administrators were told that only the regions of the country would be used, and that the reason for asking for the specific locale was to be certain that the region was classified in accord with the Bureau of Census' division of the United States.)[182] Classification and division were as follows:

Western: states of Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Idaho,

---

[181] See Appendix G, Interview Sheet.

[182] Classifications taken from the latest issue of Regions and Divisions of the United States, (Census of the United States of America), Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce, 1972.

Wyoming, Montana, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah

North Central: states of North and South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio

North Eastern: states of Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania

Southern: states of Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas; and the District of Columbia

None of the administrators interviewed were from the states of Alaska or Hawaii nor were any from territories or possessions of the United States.

Of the 27 administrators interviewed six (22+%) were from the Western region; nine (33+%) were from the North Central region; nine (33+%) were from the North Eastern region; and three (11+%) were from the Southern region.

Of these same 27 administrators, 14 (51+%) were elementary principals; five (18+%) were superintendents; three (11+%) were curriculum coordinators; two (7+%) were assistant superintendents; and two (7+%) were superintendent-principals. One (3+%) was a principal-teacher. None of the elementary principals were responsible for more than one school, while the superintendents were responsible for from three to seven schools. Responsibility for the largest number of schools was a curriculum coordinator with 12 schools. Since the administrators, for the most part, were responsible for only one or a few schools, it would seem likely that their opinions might truly reflect the problems in elementary music education faced by the individual school or the small district. This conclusion is based on the assumption that with fewer schools under direct jurisdiction, the administrators might be closer to the basic needs and genuine problems faced by their students and teachers.

With regard to the responsibilities of the administrators who were interviewed, the survey indicated some rather significant information. (Statistical particulars are documented in Appendix G.) The factor of the relationship of the number of pupils to the number of teachers was reported by some respondents as very low. Considering the present economic situation, the teacher-pupil ratio as reported is striking.

Only six (22+%) of all the administrators reported that their school(s) began with pre-kindergarten. These six included three from the Western region and three from the North Central region; there were none from either the North Eastern or the Southern regions. Nineteen (70+%) reported that their school responsibilities began with kindergarten and ended with the sixth grade. The only administrators reporting that their schools did not begin until the first grade were two (7+%) from the Southern region.

The opening question on the interview sheet purposely did not reflect the interviewer's point of view or basic thesis. Idea or opinion was sought with this question: "What do you think is happening to elementary music education?" The 27 answers to this question are quoted specifically in Appendix G; they are charted in Table 8 according to whether the administrator being interviewed thought elementary music education was advancing, was declining, or was on a plateau.

TABLE 8

Administrators' Opinions Regarding Elementary Music Education (1972)

Region of the United States	Number of Answers	Advancing	On a Plateau	Declining
Western	6	0	0	6
North Central	9	2	0	7
North Eastern	9	3	2	4
Southern	3	0	0	3
Totals	27	5	2	20
Percentages		18.00+%	7.00+%	74.00+%

Twenty administrators stated that elementary music education is declining or is not in good condition presently; two administrators felt that elementary music education was on a plateau; and five administrators reported that they thought music education was in good condition or was flourishing. Four times as many administrators expressed negative as expressed positive opinions.

The second question posed was in the form of agreement or disagreement with the researcher's thesis statement:

> Music education on the elementary level is declining at a very rapid rate at exactly the same time that new and innovational music programs are becoming more known and better understood. The music educator and those most responsible for the delivery of the music program seem inordinately "busy" with these new programs as well as occupied in intensified investigation of the subject matter of music.[183]

On this statement there was immediate discussion and clarification of the point of view of the researcher to the effect that leadership in music education was not directing its efforts toward a repair of the decline in elementary music education. Eleven (40.74%) agreed with the interviewer that elementary music education is being curtailed and is declining; seven (25.92%) partially agreed, i.e., some agreed with the first sentence and not the second and vice versa. (If these two groups, those who agreed fully and those who agreed partially are combined, 66.66% is represented.) Only seven (25.92%) actually disagreed with the thesis statement, and two (7.40%) stated that they felt that they could not truthfully answer the question.

With the exception of the last question, the next series of questions required only a "yes" or "no" statement of opinion. The first of these questions ("Are you giving up elementary music because of lack of funds?") showed 11 answering "yes"; 15 answering "no"; and one not answering at all. This would lead one to draw the assumptive conclusion that the elementary music programs were not being deleted wholly or principally because of lack of finance. Further study of the 15 "no" answers to this particular question brought out the following: The cause is not finance alone but rather a complex of matters. Some of the reasons given were:

---

[183] See Appendix G.

1. There is a stress on the academic.
2. There is a need for more music specialists to help the classroom teachers.
3. There is a general "phasing out" of elementary music education.
4. There is a need for "good" music teachers.
5. Music teachers are not meeting the musical needs of the students.
6. There is no time in the curriculum (too much reading).
7. Classroom teachers feel inadequate.

More than 50% of the administrators did not feel that the decline of music education was due totally to lack of adequate finance. Most of the respondents saw other reasons for the decline or else indicated that they viewed existing programs as satisfactory. Those who definitely saw lack of finance as the reason for the decline frequently included some descriptive account of the specific situation in their district. This information is recorded in the appendix.

With regard to the subquestion: "Is it because new and younger teachers feel less adequate in music?" most of the administrators (63%) felt that this point definitely was not the cause of the decline. While some stated that it was true that the present graduate did not seem to have the skills in music that former elementary teachers possessed, others pointed out that this situation had existed for more than 20 years and was not new. "The classroom teachers cannot teach the children to read music when they cannot read it themselves," was a frequent statement. Administrators also felt that the frequent adaptation of devices and "gimmicks" without depth of understanding on the part of elementary classroom teachers was a limiting factor and a detriment to the advancement of the music program from a long-range view.

In answer to the next subquestion: "Are there enough music specialists teaching the elementary classroom music?" the large majority of the administrators (66%) replied that there were not enough elementary music specialists who were actually "teaching" music. Several of the administrators were concerned about the music coordinator or supervisor who will not teach, but insists on a consulting role with the teacher instead of direct involvement with the children. The marked differences between the classroom teachers trying to "cover" music and the achievement of the specialist in music was pointed out repeatedly. Most administrators wished that they could have only special music teachers for music education, but several strongly felt that the special music teacher was not truly aware of the needs of the pupils.

Regarding the next subquestion: "Do we need more music specialists to 'help' the classroom teacher?" 81% replied emphatically "yes." There seemed to be a strong feeling that although music education should be taught by the specialists, there should be continuous use of music in the classroom (coordinated with other subjects, etc.) and this needed the cooperation and help of the specialist.

The last question offered opportunity for suggestions: "In your particular situation, what could be done to bring more music education into the general elementary classroom? (Your opinion of problems and how we can resolve them will be deeply appreciated. Please use reverse, if you wish, for further comments.)" The answers are specifically quoted in Appendix G but might be briefly generalized here. They fall into the following ideas:

1. more music teachers
2. better-trained music teachers
3. music teachers that are more knowledgeable of the needs of children
4. better in-service training for classroom teachers
5. cut in load for music teachers; better teacher-pupil ratio
6. better cooperation between the classroom teachers and the music specialists
7. better "follow-up" on the part of the classroom teacher
8. greater integration with other classroom subjects
9. definite time commitment for music education
10. more funds for musical materials
11. better facilities for classroom music (music room, etc.)
12. at least one teacher skilled in music education for each building

Although a complete account appears in Appendix G, several exemplary comments pointing up the need for music teachers and the lack of funds were especially strong and are worthy of quote:

> Until this year, 1971-72, I had good adequate classroom instruction by a total of five music specialists. They were all released, however, in June, due to a cutback of $300,000 in the educational budget for the 1972-72 school terms.
>
> More funds. As the district grew, we did not add funds to provide for extra music teachers and there was too much work for those music teachers we had anyway. The end result is that there has been a cutback in the amount of music that the children are getting.
>
> My reason probably will differ greatly from those in large systems. Since my school is rural our main problem is lack of funds. This is the only reason we do not have all the elementary music teachers we need.

Summary

It was the purpose of this research to study the broad diversity of contemporary practices and problems in the elementary music education programs of America, especially by means of research surveys administered in 1972. The researcher's broad experience and observation in many areas of elementary music education, in both large and small districts, led to these basic hypotheses:

1. that music education is declining nationally in both quantity and quality in the elementary schools
2. that the direction, purpose, and philosophy of elementary music is nebulous

Refutation or agreement with these hypotheses was sought by collecting data and information in the following ways:

1. by a random sampling--by means of a questionnaire--of over ten

percent of the elementary districts listed in the official United States directory of public schools (covering grades pre-kindergarten through six)

2. by personal interviews with elementary administrators regarding problems and direction in elementary music education

Data from the questionnaire revealed the fact that over 22% of the school districts in the United States do not begin free public education for its children until grade one; that over 5% of the school districts begin free public education in pre-kindergarten; and that the vast majority begin free public education in kindergarten. The returns from the questionnaire brought the greatest response from districts with only one school in the whole district; the smallest response came from the very largest districts. The question of the relationship between the size of the district and its practices and problems became important; this relationship was subjected to statistical analysis.

The statistical analysis revealed a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the following factors:

1. when public school begins
2. the stated primary goals for music programs
3. the stated secondary goals for music programs
4. the stated existence of innovational music programs
5. the expression of need for upgrading the music program
6. the existence of grants (state, federal, or other)
7. statements of need for financial assistance for the music program
8. "who" teaches the elementary classroom music

9. the help that a regular classroom teacher teaching music gets for her music program
10. the availability of recordings correlated with music texts
11. the teaching of music reading
12. a plan for teaching instrumental training at different grade levels
13. the amount of time devoted to instrumental training classes
14. the existence of a string program
15. the existence of an elementary school orchestra
16. the existence of an elementary school band
17. the frequency with which the elementary school band rehearses
18. the existence of an elementary school choral program
19. the grades that participate in the choral program
20. the number of public performances of choral groups

The statistical analysis revealed that there was no significant relationship between the size of the school district and the following factors:

1. the beginning grade for music instruction
2. a stated philosopher in education or music as the model for the music program
3. the kinds of innovational programs reported
4. the continuance of a previously-bestowed grant
5. the manner in which monies, if appropriated, would be used
6. the amount of time allotted for the teaching of general classroom music
7. the grade level at which music reading is begun

8. the frequency of the music reading lesson
9. the existence of instrumental training classes

The strongest relationship between the size of the school district and certain factors was seen in the existence of the string program (teaching the strings), where over 92% of the smallest districts reported that they did not have a string program. The percentage for this response consistently declines to ten percent (in the largest districts). The second strongest relationship was displayed in the case of the existence of the elementary school orchestra.

The third strongest relationship between the size of the school district and factors of the music program was evidenced in the answers to the questions regarding "who" actually teaches the classroom music. Over 80% of the largest districts say that their classroom teachers teach elementary music whereas the smallest districts report 22+%. Inversely, the smallest districts reported that over 77% engaged music specialists for their music programs as opposed to only 19% reported by the largest districts.

The relationship between the primary goals that the music educators reported and various factors in the music program was also subjected to statistical analysis. It was found that there _is_ a significant relationship between the stated primary goals and the following factors:

1. "who" does the teaching of the classroom music
2. the plan to teach different instruments at different grades
3. the existence of a special string program
4. the person engaged to teach the string program

_No_ significant relationship was found between the stated primary goals and the following factors:

1. whether music reading was or was not taught
2. whether an instrumental training program did or did not exist
3. when instrumental training classes began (what grade)
4. whether an elementary orchestra did or did not exist

The strongest relationships were found to exist between the stated primary goals and the existence of a string program and in the choice of teacher for that string program. Child-oriented goals were most frequently the stated primary goals for those who did have a string program. Development of individual talents, social, and cultural goals were significantly related to the selection of a specialist in strings for the classes rather than a band instructor or some other educator. A significant relationship was found between those districts whose instrumental training programs were patterned after a plan to offer different instruments in different grades and stated primary goals of enjoyment, appreciation of music, as well as various social goals.

One of the most important findings of this survey lay in the opinions expressed by the respondents regarding their own programs. Voluntary remarks on the reverse and sides of the questionnaire sheet were tabulated in terms of the respondents' statements of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their own programs. The most frequently stated reasons for this dissatisfaction were as follows:

1. lack of adequate teacher skills in music
2. lack of scheduled time for elementary music
3. lack of adequate funds for the music program
4. lack of administrative and community support for the program

5. lack of discipline in the music classes
6. problems caused by the size of the school or district (too small, too large)
7. impossible teacher-student ratio
8. low priority of music on the curriculum
9. lack of student interest

Tabulations from the interviews with the elementary administrators revealed that 67% of the administrators agreed either partially or wholly with the investigator's assumptive statement, namely, that elementary music education in the United States was declining in 1972. Although lack of funds was found to be a strong cause of this decline (in the opinions of the administrators), it was neither the primary nor the only cause cited. Other factors were stated as major in the decisions to give up elementary music education. Some of these were:

1. inadequate music staff (teacher-student ratio)
2. incapable music teachers
3. inadequate time commitment to music
4. pressures due to mandated subjects; low priority for music
5. unwillingness of music specialists to assume teaching roles
6. unwillingness of music specialists to work on the elementary level
7. music specialists not meeting the needs of the children
8. music specialists unable to handle the discipline

Sixty-six percent of the administrators indicated that there were not enough music specialists and 81% felt that even if they had more specialists to teach the regular elementary music classes, there would be a need for a music specialist to give support to the regular classroom teacher in order to carry out a desirable music program.

Most frequently unanswered items in the questionnaire were those related to the philosophy of the music education program and the goals for the program. Most frequently answered items were those related to the subject matter of elementary music education. Neglected significantly were references to specific philosophers, educators, and psychologists, such as Bruner, Dewey, Piaget, Skinner, Bloom, Silberman, etc. Rarely mentioned were new curriculum designs, such as MMCP, YMC, or CMP. Mentioned more frequently were MENC, Kodály, Orff, Richards, Mursell, etc.

Despite the fact that over 37% of the respondents made voluntary remarks about their programs (some very extensive), very few of these remarks were concerned with the child; most were concerned with the problems of teaching.

It would be impossible to define an innovative elementary music education program in 1972 if the bases for the statement were the ideas revealed in the responses to the questionnaire. While over 23% of the respondents reported that they did have an innovational program, there were so many different interpretations of true "innovation" that no defining pattern could result. This was not true in the answers to items related to the "upgrading" of the music programs and, while these represented many different ideas, they fell easily into recognizable categories:

31.23%	more special music teachers
17.19%	more time for music
12.03%	improvement in methods of teaching music

8.88%	more musical materials, equipment; better facilities
4.87%	new courses, special programs
3.72%	more cooperation from students, parents, administration
3.44%	more useful texts (updated and directed to the classroom teacher)
2.87%	more money for music
2.87%	smaller classes; individualized instruction
2.87%	more in-service training
10.03%	other ways (single expressions)

Over four times as many of the larger districts than the smaller districts had been given grants for their music programs; yet there was no relationship found between the size of the school district and the ability to continue the program after fund cutoffs. The percentage of districts grows from smallest to largest when the expression of need for financial assistance for the music program is considered, i.e., the largest districts much more strongly express the need for financial assistance.

It is obvious that the minimum recommendations of the MENC (90 minutes of music instruction per week, as of July, 1972) are not maintained. The largest percentage (almost 40%) of districts state that they teach music in the classroom between 20 and 40 minutes per week. Less than 15% of the districts report that they allot 95 or more minutes per week to elementary classroom music.

While there was a significant relationship revealed between the size of the school district and the teaching of music reading, the differences are not great. Over 87% of the districts report that they do teach music reading, and the larger districts report higher percentages than do the smaller districts.

Instrumental training is overwhelmingly popular in the elementary schools of the nation. It has grown tremendously in the past 20 years; only 14.77% of the school districts report that they do not have instrumental training programs. Most of the time devoted to instrumental training is concentrated on the band instruments--there are far fewer string programs--and the existence of bands is still very much higher proportionately than the existence of orchestras. The choral program as a separate entity has developed strongly in the elementary schools, and over 58% of the school districts report a special choral program with some fourth graders, but mostly fifth and sixth graders participating. All groups are appearing in public performances, with the most popular number of appearances being two per year and the smaller districts scheduling far more frequent public appearances than the larger districts.

The data revealed very little evidence of concern on the part of respondents to the questionnaire for:

1. the urgency of existing problems in elementary music education on a nationwide basis
2. the need for a basic philosophy or a clear statement of purpose for elementary music education
3. the need for more extensive understanding of aesthetic values in elementary music education
4. the need for greater working knowledge of the results of intensive research in early childhood learning
5. the need for greater working knowledge of the more recent

work in psychology of music and how it relates to the musical training of young students

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Elementary music education, as a broad subject for research, offers many avenues for investigation. There is a need to bring into proper focus the basic nature of the aesthetic experience, the true value and purpose of the musical experience for young children. There is a need to understand the philosophical bases for the many and varied existing programs (some old, some new) in elementary music education in order to more clearly see "why" music educators are doing "what" they are doing. There is a need to seek out and understand relevant research in other fields in order to relate findings of value to the many facets of the "how" in learning music on the elementary level.

Many of these needs could be explored with more meaning and the results of the studies utilized more fruitfully if a valid survey were available as a base. This investigation, in the nature of such a survey, was designed to serve as an initial step and as a basis for further research. Its purpose was to explore and investigate the many factors of elementary music education in order to present the facts of present practices and present problems. It hoped to provide some of the necessary groundwork for the establishment of "direction" in the goal for improving the music education program on the elementary level.

There is evidence from some points of view that music in society is flourishing in the country but no such evidence that elementary music education is in a state of similar health. Frequently reported is the fact that never before has so much music been heard so much of the time by so many people. Questions and problems of musical understanding and discrimination are raised. Edwin Gordon states that the general purpose of music education should be to teach students to understand the music they hear,[184] yet frequently reported is the statement that musically, America is an illiterate and culturally-deprived nation. It is known that the average college-bound student is frequently culturally-deprived in that he sometimes finds little or no provision in his high school schedule for music; it is known also that music programs for younger students are being drastically curtailed in some places. Yet recognized by music educators is the responsibility of music education to society. Many agree with Bennett Reimer:

> Music education has a dual obligation to society. The first is to develop the talents of those who are gifted musically, for their own personal benefit, for the benefit of the society which will be served by them, for the benefit of the art of music which depends on a continuing supply of composers, performers, conductors, scholars, teachers. The second obligation is to develop the aesthetic sensitivity to music of all people regardless of their individual levels of musical talent, for their own personal benefit, for the benefit of society which needs an active cultural life, for the benefit of the art of music which depends on a continuing supply of sympathetic, sensitive consumers. These two obligations are mutually supportive: the neglect of either one inevitably weakens both.[185]

This study sought to investigate the extent of the curtailment of elementary music programs by an analysis of existing practices and problems. It based its research on hypotheses to the effect that music education on the elementary level in 1972 is declining in both quantity and quality and further, that a clear philosophy of direction is lacking.

---

[184] Edwin Gordon, op. cit., p. 63.

[185] Bennett Reimer, op. cit., p. 112.

A sample survey of the National Education Association, representing school systems all over the United States during 1961-62, utilized the questionnaire to collect its data surveying elementary music education. The summary statement began as follows:

> The data collected in this survey indicate that music holds a firm position in the elementary-school curriculum. Time allotments in recent years had remained the same or increased--seldom decreased. A high percentage of schools employed music specialists. The majority of schools offered pupil instruction on musical instruments. Record players, tape recorders, pianos, and rhythm instruments were available.[186]

Further, the NEA study (1961-62) shows that smaller districts (fewer than 6,000 pupils) were likely to suffer disadvantages as compared to larger districts (6,000 pupils or more). In terms of the smaller districts, the NEA findings can be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Less formal instruction.
2. Less time allotted for music.
3. Fewer specialists employed.
4. Less likely to provide classroom teacher help through workshops.
5. Less opportunity for instruction in groups or individually.
6. Even one-teacher schools often had their own record player and opportunities to enjoy music.[187]

The NEA questionnaire was sent to elementary principals. The questionnaire for the present study was sent to elementary superintendents of districts with the request that it be forwarded to a member of the staff knowledgeable in the district's elementary music program. The "firm position" of elementary music education as reported in the NEA study may be compared to the present findings ten years later on many of the identical points.

---

[186] Charles L. Gary, reviewing Music and Art in the Public Schools, NEA Research Division Monograph, 1963, in Journal of Research in Music Education, Volume XI, No. 2, Fall, 1963, p. 146.

[187] Ibid.

Conclusions

The principal conclusions of this investigation may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. In the opinion of elementary music educators, the music program suffers from:
    a. lack of adequate teacher skills in music
    b. lack of adequate time for music
    c. lack of adequate funds for music
    d. lack of administrative and community support
    e. lack of student interest
    f. low priority for music on the curriculum
    g. lack of discipline in music classes
    h. impossible teacher-student ratio
    i. the size of the school district (too small, too large)
2. In the opinion of elementary school administrators, elementary music education is declining because of:
    a. inadequate music staff (numbers and ability)
    b. inadequate time commitment to music
    c. pressures from mandated subjects

   d. inadequate funds
   e. unwillingness of music specialists to assume teaching roles
   f. inability of music specialists to meet the needs of children
   g. inability of music specialists to handle discipline

3. The statistical data revealed the facts that:
   a. Weekly time spent in elementary classroom music is far less than that recommended by the MENC. (About 40% of the school districts spend between 20 and 40 minutes a week on music instruction; only 15% spend 95 minutes or more.)
   b. The regular classroom teacher teaches music in over 80% of the largest school districts as compared with only 20% in the smallest school districts. (The MENC, in July, 1972, recommended a music specialist for elementary classroom music.)
   c. Over 87% of all elementary school districts report that they do teach music reading.
   d. Band is overwhelmingly popular, but the string programs suffer in the smallest districts.
   e. Over 85% of the school districts report that they have instrumental training classes, and over 58% report that they have a special choral program.
   f. Public appearances take place at least twice a year in nearly all the districts reporting instrumental and

choral groups.

g. Size of the school district is still a factor:

(1) In the smaller districts: Greater emphasis is on the development of musical skills; three times as many musical specialists teach music as classroom teachers; a higher percentage have bands; band rehearsals take place twice as often; choral groups include earlier grades.

(2) In the larger districts: There is a higher percentage of pre-kindergarten instruction; the greatest emphasis is on music for pleasure; they feel a greater need to upgrade their music programs; grants are received more frequently; the need for financial assistance is expressed more frequently; more help is given to the classroom teacher teaching music; a larger percentage of correlated recordings is reported; string programs are much stronger; they have more orchestras and choral groups.

4. No uniformity of thought, no pattern of thinking was expressed on the following:

   a. a basic philosophy for elementary music education

   b. preferred primary and secondary goals (primary for some is secondary for others)

5. Little evidence of influence on the elementary music program was seen in relation to:

   a. the Suzuki program

  - b. the Contemporary Music Project
  - c. the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Project
  - d. the Yale Music Curriculum
  - e. the Central Midwest Regional Laboratory on Aesthetic Education
  - f. the Juilliard Repertory
  - g. the Hawaii Curriculum Project
  - h. music education in television
  - i. programmed learning in elementary music education
  - j. the "GC" project of the MENC
  - k. contemporary philosophy and psychology in music education
  - l. Titles I and III, ESEA

6. The greatest amount of program influence was evidenced in relation to:
   - a. Kodály
   - b. Orff
   - c. Kodály-Orff-Richards, etc.
   - d. instrumental training classes
   - e. the band and the choral programs
7. No relationship was found between:
   - a. stated primary goals and "who" teaches the elementary music
   - b. stated primary goals and the fact that music reading is or is not taught
   - c. stated primary goals and the instrumental training program

Recommendations

As a result of the investigation reported in the foregoing pages, and as a consequence of the conclusions reported in this chapter, the following recommendations are offered:

1. that a repetition of this study be undertaken in order to verify the findings with other research populations
2. that a study of basic philosophy and aesthetic values of elementary music be undertaken in order to assist all elementary educators in establishing primary purposes of the music program
3. that the weaknesses of the present elementary music program in the schools be brought to the attention of all elementary educators with suggestions and recommendations for correcting these weaknesses
4. that a study of ways and means of bringing more and better trained music specialists into the elementary schools be undertaken
5. that a study of student interests and ways and means of adapting to the needs and interests of young people be undertaken
6. that a study of ways and means of working closer with elementary administrators and community leaders be undertaken in order to alter the climate for elementary music education in the public schools
7. that each of the above studies be undertaken by the MENC with

a program of action and implementation to follow in order to improve the status of elementary music education in the public schools of the nation.

APPENDIXES[*]

---

[*] All "A" tables chart the raw data; all "B" tables chart the calculations for the statistical analysis and the proportional analysis.

Where there is no statistical analysis, an interpretation of the raw data and percentages reported may be found in Chapter IV.

APPENDIX A

SCHOOLS IN THE DISTRICT

TABLES

1. When does free public school instruction begin in the United States?

    A 1.1 Raw data

    B 1.1 Statistical analysis; proportional data

2. When does music instruction begin?

    A 1.2 Raw data

    B 1.2 Statistical analysis; proportional data

A 1.1
A 1.2

THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. Are the public elementary schools changing to meet the findings of psychologists that the greatest amount of learning takes place in the earlier years?
2. Is free instruction being offered at earlier ages?
3. Are there many free public elementary schools that still do not offer instruction until grade 1?
4. Are there free public elementary schools that offer no music at all in the U.S.?
5. When does regular, planned music instruction begin?

Number of schools in the district	A 1.1 Public school begins:			A 1.2 Planned, organized, regular music instruction begins:									
	In pre-kindergarten	In kindergarten	In grade 1	No music program in elementary school	In pre-kindergarten	In kindergarten	In grade 1	In grade 2	In grade 3	In grade 4	In grade 5	In grade 6	Higher than grade 6
1	2	74	19	5	1	53	43	1	2	2	2	2	0
2	0	33	4	0	0	24	11	0	2	0	1	0	0
3	4	18	7	1	0	20	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	2	16	9	0	1	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	17	7	1	0	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0
6-10	0	57	25	1	0	41	40	0	0	0	0	0	1
11-25	6	46	11	0	4	27	27	0	0	0	0	0	0
26-50	4	10	6	0	2	5	10	0	0	1	0	0	0
51-100	3	9	2	0	1	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Over 100	1	5	0	0	0	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	22	285	90	8	9	203	169	2	4	3	3	1	1
	397			403									
Percentages	5.52	71.79	22.69	1.90	2.20	50.37	41.93	0.40	0.90	0.70	0.20	0.20	0.20

B 1.1 When does public school begin?

Number of schools in the district	Pre-K (%)	K (%)	Grade 1 (%)	Total
1-3	6 (3.73)	125 (77.64)	30 (18.63)	161
4-10	2 (1.50)	90 (67.67)	41 (30.83)	133
11-25	6 (9.52)	46 (73.02)	11 (17.46)	63
26 and over	8 (20.00)	24 (60.00)	8 (20.00)	40
TOTALS	22 (05.54)	285 (71.79)	90 (22.67)	397

$G = 24.657$ $X_c^2 = 12.5916$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and when children begin school in the United States, i.e., whether they start with pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, or first grade.

B 1.2 Music starts when?

Number of schools in the district	Pre-K & K (%)	Grade 1 (%)	Total
1-3	108 (59.67)	73 (40.33)	181
4-10	64 (50.39)	63 (49.61)	127
11-25	31 (53.45)	27 (46.55)	58
26 and over	19 (50.00)	19 (50.00)	38
TOTALS	222 (54.95)	182 (45.05)	404

$G = 3.1278$ $X_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there was no significant relationship between the size of the school district and the grade level at which music instruction was begun.

APPENDIX B

BASIC PHILOSOPHY OF THE MUSIC EDUCATION PROGRAM

TABLES

1. Is the program modeled after an educational philosopher?
    - A 2.1 Raw data
    - A 2.2 Raw data
    - B 2.1 Statistical analysis; proportional data
    - B 2.2 No statistical analysis
2. Is the program modeled after a musician or music educator?
    - A 3.1 Raw data
    - B 3.1 No statistical analysis
3. What is the basic music education philosophy?
    - A 4.1 Raw data
    - A 4.2 Raw data
    - B 4.1 No statistical analysis
    - B 4.2 No statistical analysis
4. What do music educators state as their chief or primary goals?
    - A 5.1 Raw data
    - B 5.1 No statistical analysis
5. What do the music educators state as their secondary goals?
    - A 6.1 Raw data
    - B 6.1 No statistical analysis
6. What is the relationship between the primary and the secondary goals?

A 7.1 Reorganization of A 5.1 and A 6.1

B 7.1 Statistical analysis; proportional data

B 7.2 Statistical analysis; proportional data

7. How are the goals reflected in the program? (Raw data too diffuse for statistical analysis or any evaluation. See Results of the Questionnaire, Chapter IV.)

8. Do the music educators think they have innovational programs?

A 8.1 Raw data

B 8.1 Statistical analysis; proportional data

9. How many different ideas were expressed as innovational?

A 8.2 Raw data

B 8.2 No statistical analysis

10. Is the stated innovative program student-, teacher-, or subject-oriented?

A 8.3 Raw data

B 8.3 Statistical analysis; proportional data

11. Do music educators state a need to "upgrade" their music programs?

A 9.1 Raw data

B 9.1 Statistical analysis; proportional data

12. In how many different ways was the need to "upgrade" expressed?

A 9.2 Raw data

B 9.2 No statistical analysis

13. What recommendations do the music educators have for "upgrading" their music programs?

A 9.3 Reorganization of the raw data

B 9.3 No statistical analysis

A 2.1
A 2.2

THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. Is music education influenced by particular educational philosophers?
2. If so, who are these philosophers?
3. Is there a relationship between the size of the district (number of schools in the district) and general educational philosophies and philosophers?

Number of schools in the district	A 2.1 Modeled after an educational philosopher			A 2.2 Modeled after ... a particular educational philosopher:							Modeled after ... a general philosophy:						.. a music educator:	
	NA	No	Yes	None named	Many	Froebel	Dewey	Skinner	Bruner	Piaget	Open classroom	State test	Classroom teacher	Building principal	State requirements	Other	Specific music educator	Other, e.g., MENC goals
1	31	66	21	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	13	1
2	15	22	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
3	10	15	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0
4	12	13	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0
5	13	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0
6-10	34	42	12	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	8	1
11-25	22	31	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	1
26-50	12	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0
51-100	7	5	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
Over 100	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Totals	159	214	71	1	5	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	5	2	1	4	48	4
	444																	
Percentages	35.81	48.20	15.99															

B 2.1 Was the music program modeled after an educational philosopher?

Number of schools in the district	No (%)	Yes (%)	Total
1-3	103 (75.18)	34 (24.82)	137
4-10	66 (79.52)	17 (20.48)	83
11-25	31 (72.09)	12 (27.91)	43
26 and over	14 (63.64)	8 (36.36)	22
TOTALS	214 (75.09)	71 (24.91)	285

G = 2.5292 X_c^2 = 7.81473

The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the size of the school district and the fact that the music program was or was not modeled after an educational philosopher.

A 3.1 **THE BASIC QUESTIONS:**

1. Is music education influenced by particular musicians or music educators today?
2. If so, who are these musicians and music educators?
3. Is there any relationship between the size of the school district and the particular musician or music educator used as a model?

Number of schools in the district	A 3.1 The music education philosophy is based upon the thinking of:							
	Mursell	Giddings	Kodály	Orff	Kodály-Orff	Richards	Suzuki	Others
1	0	1	10	1	2	1	0	0
2	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0
3	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0
4	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0
5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
6-10	0	0	1	0	6	0	1	0
11-25	1	0	4	0	3	2	0	1
26-50	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
51-100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Over 100	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	4	1	21	4	14	5	1	2

A 4.1
A 4.2

THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. What do the respondents state is the basic music education philosophy? Upon what are their programs based?
2. What is stressed most in the programs? Is a basic purpose stated?
3. Is the philosophy of the music program in any way related to the size of the district?

Number of schools in the district	A 4.1		A 4.2 The basic philosophy stresses:													
		Have no philosophy	Fun/Enjoyment/ Love of Music	Appreciation/ Enrichment	Participation/ Performance	Literacy/ Skills	Individual child	Aesthetic Sensitivity	Social maturation	Music for every child/Child's Bill of Rights	Exploration/ Musical experiences	Place of music in life/Develop interest	Classroom teacher's philosophy	Music specialist's idea	Tanglewood Declaration	Other
	NA		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
1	20	3	23	11	12	19	4	1	0	15	10	1	3	0	0	2
2	8	2	8	7	2	7	2	1	0	3	1	0	1	1	0	0
3	3	0	6	6	2	1	1	0	1	10	3	1	1	1	0	0
4	6	0	6	3	1	2	1	0	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	0
5	5	1	4	2	0	2	1	0	1	6	2	2	0	1	0	0
6-10	12	9	14	3	3	7	8	6	5	13	10	1	1	1	1	0
11-25	7	0	8	5	1	5	6	6	2	15	4	2	2	0	0	8
26-50	3	0	3	2	2	0	3	2	0	3	4	0	4	0	0	0
51-100	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	2	1
Over 100	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0
Totals	64	16	73	41	26	44	28	17	11	73	36	7	17	4	3	11
	471															
Percentages	13.59	3.40	15.50	8.70	5.52	9.34	5.94	3.61	2.34	15.50	7.64	1.49	3.61	0.85	0.64	2.34

A 5.1 THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. What do music educators today state as their chief or primary goals?

Number of schools in the district	A 5.1	"Fun"/Enjoyment in music	"Love" of music	Appreciation/ "Understanding" in music	Participation/ Involvement in music	Literacy in music/ Basic skill	Performance skills in music	Creative ability in music	Development of each child's interest in music	Self-realization/ Individualized instruction	Multi-ethnic/ Cultural heritage/ Social	Other
	NA	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1	16	23	2	22	12	23	6	0	8	2	1	2
2	[illegible]	13	0	9	2	6	1	1	3	0	0	0
3	10	9	2	2	1	3	0	2	1	1	1	0
4	6	6	0	9	2	2	0	0	2	1	0	0
5	3	4	0	11	1	4	1	0	2	0	0	0
6-10	16	19	4	13	15	8	1	0	6	4	1	2
11-25	11	8	3	15	7	5	0	1	9	1	3	2
26-50	6	3	1	2	3	1	1	0	5	0	0	0
51-100	2	3	1	2	4	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
Over 100	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	0
Totals	80	88	13	86	49	53	10	5	39	9	7	6
	445											
Percentages	17.98	19.78	2.92	19.33	11.01	11.91	2.25	1.12	8.96	2.02	1.59	1.35

A 6.1 **THE BASIC QUESTIONS:**

1. What do music educators today state as their secondary goals?

Number of schools in the district	A 6.1	"Fun"/Enjoyment in music	"Love" of music	Appreciation/ "Understanding" in music	Participation/ Involvement in music	Literacy in music/ Basic skill	Performance skills in music	Creative ability in music	Development of each child's interest in music	Self-realization/ Individualized instruction	Multi-ethnic/ Cultural heritage/ Social	Other
	NA	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1	23	7	2	19	9	26	23	0	0	2	1	6
2	8	4	0	5	2	14	9	0	1	0	0	0
3	14	0	0	4	2	5	3	0	1	1	2	0
4	8	2	0	3	1	7	3	0	3	1	0	0
5	3	1	0	4	3	7	1	0	1	4	1	0
6-10	29	2	0	7	7	24	10	3	0	3	0	4
11-25	21	0	0	7	5	16	8	0	2	2	2	2
26-50	7	1	1	2	0	3	5	0	1	1	0	1
51-100	3	0	0	1	0	6	1	0	1	2	1	0
Over 100	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	2	0
Totals	118	17	3	53	30	108	64	4	10	16	9	13
						445						
Percentages	26.52	3.82	0.67	11.91	6.74	24.27	14.38	0.90	2.25	3.60	2.02	2.92

A 7.1 **THE BASIC QUESTIONS:**

1. What is the relationship between the primary goal and the secondary goal in elementary music education? If the goals are divided into four categories - (I) goals of appreciation; (II) goals of skill; (III) goals of individual child; (IV) social, cultural; and (V) other goals - which are (a) primary and which are (b) secondary?
2. Is there any difference between the basic goals of the smaller and those of the larger districts?

Number of schools in the district	A 7.1 A,B,C,D Fun, love, enjoyment, appreciation, understanding, participation, involvement, aesthetics		E,F,G Basic skills, literacy, performance skills, creative skills, ability		H,I Child-centered, development of each child, self-realization, individual instruction		J Social, cultural, multi-ethnic heritage		K Other: seek talents, coordinate with other subjects, round out education	
	Ia	Ib	IIa	IIb	IIIa	IIIb	IVa	IVb	Va	Vb
1	59	37	29	49	10	2	1	1	2	6
2	24	11	8	23	3	1	0	0	0	0
3	14	6	5	8	2	2	1	2	0	0
4	17	5	2	10	3	4	0	0	0	0
5	16	8	5	8	2	5	0	1	0	0
6-10	51	16	9	37	10	3	1	0	2	4
11-25	33	12	6	24	10	3	3	2	2	2
26-50	9	4	2	8	5	2	0	0	0	1
51-100	10	1	2	7	1	3	0	1	0	0
Over 100	3	1	0	7	2	3	1	1	0	0
Totals	236	101	68	181	48	28	7	8	6	13
a & b Totals	337		249		76		15		19	
a & b Percentages	70.03	29.97	27.31	72.69	63.16	36.84	46.67	53.33	31.58	68.42
a Percentages (365 responses)	64.65		18.63		13.15		(IVa & Va)	03.54		
b Percentages (331 responses)		30.51		54.68		08.45	(IVb & Vb)	06.34		

B 7.1 Is there a relationship between the primary goals ("a" goals) stated by the music educators and the size of the district?

PRIMARY GOALS*

Number of schools in the district	Ia (%)	IIa (%)	IIIa (%)	IVa/Va (%)	Total
1-3	97 (61.39)	42 (26.58)	15 (09.49)	4 (02.53)	158
4-10	84 (71.19)	16 (13.56)	15 (12.71)	3 (02.54)	118
11-25	33 (61.11)	6 (11.11)	10 (18.52)	5 (09.26)	54
26 and over	22 (62.86)	4 (11.43)	8 (22.86)	1 (02.86)	35
TOTALS	236 (64.66)	68 (18.63)	48 (13.15)	13 (03.56)	365

G = 20.6592 $X_c^2 = 16.9190$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the primary goals stated by the music educators.

B 7.2 (See next page.)

---

*Since so many educators used exactly the same words to describe their primary goals as other educators used to describe their secondary goals, the Roman numerals represent the same points in 7.1 as in 7.2. An explanation of these goals as organized into goals of appreciation (I), goals of skill (II), goals related to the child (III), and other goals (IV/V) may be found in Chapter IV.

B 7.2 Is there any relationship between the secondary goals ("b" goals) stated by the music educators and the size of the district?

SECONDARY GOALS

Number of schools in the district	Ib (%)	IIb (%)	IIIb (%)	IVb/Vb (%)	Total
1-3	54 (36.49)	80 (54.05)	5 (03.38)	9 (06.08)	148
4-10	29 (28.71)	55 (54.46)	12 (11.88)	5 (04.95)	101
11-25	12 (27.91)	24 (55.81)	3 (06.98)	4 (09.30)	43
26 and over	6 (15.39)	22 (56.41)	8 (20.51)	3 (07.69)	39
TOTALS	101 (30.51)	181 (54.68)	28 (08.46)	21 (06.34)	331

G = 18.4255 $X_c^2 = 16.9190$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the secondary goals stated by the music educators.

A 8.1
A 8.2
A 8.3

THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. Are music educators today exploring new ideas, new programs?
2. What do the music educators consider "innovational"?
3. As stated by the educators, are the programs student-, teacher-, or subject-oriented?
4. Does the size of the district have anything to do with the existence of innovational programs?

Number of schools in the district	A 8.1 Is yours an innovational program?				A 8.2 Number of different ideas called innovational	A 8.3 Basis of respondent's description of innovative programs			
	NA	No	Partly	Yes		Student-oriented	Teacher-oriented	Subject-oriented	Reported innovative; no reason given
1	33	46	5	32	32	8	3	22	3
2	17	17	2	7	8	1	2	6	0
3	8	13	2	9	9	4	2	5	0
4	5	18	1	3	5	0	1	2	0
5	9	10	0	7	7	0	1	6	0
6-10	17	48	7	15	20	4	6	10	2
11-25	10	31	9	15	21	1	5	17	1
26-50	6	5	2	8	10	1	1	8	0
51-100	5	5	0	5	5	0	3	2	0
Over 100	2	2	3	1	3	2	0	2	0
Totals	112	195	31	102	120	21	24	80	6
	440					131			
Percentages	25.45	44.32	7.05	23.18		16.03	18.32	61.07	4.58

B 8.1 Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and the stated existence of an innovational music program?

Is Your Music Program Innovational?

Number of schools in the district	No (%)	Partly (%)	Yes (%)	Total
1-3	40 (41.24)	9 (09.28)	48 (49.48)	97
4-10	76 (69.72)	8 (07.34)	25 (22.94)	109
11-25	31 (56.36)	9 (16.36)	15 (27.27)	55
26 and over	12 (38.71)	5 (16.13)	14 (45.16)	31
TOTALS	159 (54.45)	31 (10.62)	102 (34.93)	292

G = 25.0959 $X_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the stated existence of an innovational music program.

B 8.3 Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and the kinds of innovational programs in music education that the educators said they had?

Number of schools in the district	Student-Oriented (%)	Teacher-Oriented (%)	Subject-Oriented (%)	Total
1-3	13 (24.53)	7 (13.21)	33 (62.26)	53
4-10	4 (13.33)	8 (26.67)	18 (60.00)	30
11-25	1 (04.35)	5 (21.74)	17 (73.91)	23
26 and over	3 (15.79)	4 (21.05)	12 (63.16)	19
TOTALS	21 (16.80)	24 (19.20)	80 (64.00)	125

G = 7.3526 $X_c^2 = 12.5916$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the size of the school district and the statements of the educators concerning the kinds of innovational programs that they had.

A 9.1
A 9.2
A 9.3

THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. Do the responding music educators feel a need to "upgrade" their programs?
2. What recommendations do they make for so doing?
3. Does the size of the school district have anything to do with the expressed need to "upgrade"?

Number of schools in the district	A 9.1 Need to "upgrade" the music program?			A 9.2	A 9.3 What recommendations given for "upgrading" music program?										
				In how many different ways was the need expressed?	More time for music	More money for music	More instruments, materials, equipment, facilities	Update the texts direct toward class teacher	Improve the methods	More special music teachers	Smaller classes; Individualized instruction	More in-service training; Teacher growth	New courses; Special programs	Cooperation from parents, administration, students	Other
	NA	No.	Yes		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1	16	13	90	61	17	4	17	6	6	19	1	1	4	4	10
2	8	4	31	30	3	3	1	3	2	8	2	0	5	1	0
3	6	2	24	21	4	0	3	0	3	3	1	3	3	0	1
4	7	3	17	16	2	0	2	0	2	5	1	1	0	0	3
5	3	4	19	18	3	2	4	0	2	3	1	1	2	1	0
6-10	10	6	71	66	16	0	0	1	13	26	1	2	2	4	9
11-25	2	1	62	53	9	1	3	1	10	25	1	2	1	1	8
26-50	1	1	19	17	5	0	0	0	1	11	0	0	0	0	2
51-100	2	0	13	12	0	0	1	1	2	6	2	0	0	2	1
Over 100	1	1	6	6	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	1
Totals	56	35	352	300	60	10	31	12	42	109	10	10	17	13	35
	443				349										
Percentages	12.64	7.90	79.45		17.19	2.87	8.88	3.44	12.03	31.23	2.87	2.87	4.87	3.72	10.03

B 9.1 Is there any relationship between the size of the school district and the statements by the music educators that they should or should not upgrade their music programs?

Need to Upgrade Your Music Program?

Number of schools in the district	No (%)	Yes (%)	Total
1-3	19 (11.59)	145 (88.41)	164
4-10	13 (10.83)	107 (89.17)	120
11-25	1 (01.59)	62 (98.41)	63
26 and over	2 (05.00)	38 (95.00)	40
TOTALS	35 (09.04)	352 (90.96)	387

G = 8.8598 X_c^2 = 7.81473

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the statements of music educators as to whether they felt they should or should not upgrade their music program.

APPENDIX C

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE MUSIC PROGRAM

TABLES

1. Has there been a grant for music education?

   A 10.1 Raw data

   B 10.1 Statistical analysis; proportional data

2. What kind of grant has the district had?

   A 10.2 Raw data

   B 10.2 No statistical analysis

3. Is the financially-assisted program still functioning?

   A 10.3 Raw data

   B 10.3 Statistical analysis; proportional data

4. Why is the program not functioning today?

   A 10.4 Raw data

   B 10.4 No statistical analysis

5. Is there a need for financial assistance for present music programs?

   A 11.1 Raw data

   B 11.1 Statistical analysis; proportional data

6. How would the music educators use the financial assistance if they now had it?

   A 11.2 Raw data

   B 11.2 Statistical analysis; proportional data

A 10.1
A 10.2
A 10.3
A 10.4

THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. In the case of ESEA (Titles I and III), what has happened to programs utilizing federal grants? Who has had the grants (federal and state) for music education?
2. Are these programs still getting federal or other monies?
3. Are they able to find ways to continue without federal monies?

Number of schools in the district	A 10.1 Has there been financial assistance for the music program?			A 10.2 Kind of grant the district had				A 10.3 Is the financially-assisted program still functioning?			A 10.4 Why is it not functioning today?				
	NA	Yes	No	NA	Federal	State	Other	NA	Yes	No	Money allotted to other areas	End of grant	Discontinued by government	No longer qualify	Political reasons
1	8	13	93	3	9	1	0	3	3	5	0	0	3	1	1
2	2	5	35	1	3	0	13	1	1	3	0	0	0	1	0
3	1	3	28	0	3	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	4	10	2	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	1	2	13	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
6-10	3	6	90	0	6	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	2	0	0
11-25	1	19	44	1	15	2	1	0	14	5	2	1	1	0	0
26-50	1	10	11	3	7	0	0	1	4	5	2	2	1	0	0
51-100	0	7	9	0	6	2	0	0	5	2	1	0	1	0	0
Over 100	1	4	3	0	3	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	18	73	336	10	56	5	15	7	39	23	5	4	8	2	1
	427			86				69			20				
Percentages	4.22	17.10	78.69	11.62	65.11	5.80	17.44	10.14	56.52	33.33	25.00	20.00	40.00	10.00	5.00

B 10.1 Is there any relationship between the size of the school district and grants that have been bestowed?

Have You Had a Grant to Aid You in Your Music Program?

Number of schools in the district	Yes (%)	No (%)	Total
1-3	21 (11.86)	156 (88.14)	177
4-10	8 (06.61)	113 (93.39)	121
11-25	19 (30.16)	44 (69.84)	63
26 and over	21 (47.73)	23 (52.27)	44
TOTALS	69 (17.04)	336 (82.96)	405

G = 43.8469 $X_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed the fact that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the previous existence of a grant for that district.

B 10.3 Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and the continuation of the school grants?

Do You Still Have Your School Grant?

Number of schools in the district	Yes (%)	No (%)	Total
1-3	6 (42.86)	8 (57.14)	14
4-10	6 (66.67)	3 (33.33)	9
11-25	14 (73.68)	5 (26.32)	19
26 and over	13 (65.00)	7 (35.00)	20
TOTALS	39 (62.90)	23 (37.10)	62

G = 3.3969 $X_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed the fact that there is no significant relationship between the size of the school district and the continuing existence of a previously bestowed grant.

A 11.1
A 11.2

THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. Do the music educators state a need for financial assistance or for larger music budgets for their music programs?
2. How would the music educators use additional money if it were granted to them?

Number of schools in the district	A 11.1 Do you need financial assistance for your present program?			A 11.2 How would you use the money?								
	NA	Yes	No	NA	Add music personnel	Materials, facilities	Field trips	Offer music to all children	More money for teachers	More music instruction	Initiate a string program	In-service training
1	23	62	34	21	16	44	3	2	3	1	0	0
2	7	25	11	9	14	10	0	1	0	0	0	0
3	3	17	11	3	7	11	1	2	0	0	0	0
4	3	13	12	4	6	8	2	0	1	0	0	0
5	6	17	3	6	11	10	0	1	0	0	1	0
6-10	5	66	20	5	32	39	2	1	1	2	3	5
11-25	2	52	12	0	36	27	0	0	1	0	1	3
26-50	2	18	2	2	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
51-100	1	13	1	0	5	9	1	0	1	1	0	0
Over 100	1	7	0	0	5	5	1	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	53	290	106	50	139	173	10	7	7	4	5	8
		449		403								
Percentages	11.80	64.59	33.60	12.46	34.66	43.14	2.49	1.74	1.74	0.99	1.24	1.99

B 11.1 Is there any relationship between the size of the school district and the expression of financial need on the part of music educators?

Need Financial Assistance for Their Music Program?

Number of schools in the district	Yes (%)	No (%)	Total
1-3	104 (65.00)	56 (35.00)	160
4-10	96 (73.28)	35 (26.72)	131
11-25	52 (81.25)	12 (18.75)	64
26 and over	38 (92.68)	3 (07.32)	41
TOTALS	290 (73.23)	106 (26.77)	396

G = 17.6100 $X_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the expression of need for financial assistance.

B 11.2 Is there any relationship between the size of the school district and the way in which the music educators would use the grant money if it were given?

How Would You Use the Money?

Number of schools in the district	For Music Personnel (%)	For Music Equipment (%)	Other Uses (%)	Total
1-3	37 (32.17)	65 (56.52)	13 (11.30)	115
4-10	49 (39.20)	57 (45.60)	19 (15.20)	125
11-25	36 (52.94)	27 (39.70)	5 (07.35)	68
26 and over	17 (37.07)	24 (54.44)	4 (08.89)	45
TOTALS	139 (39.38)	162 (49.01)	41 (11.61)	353

$G = 10.3364$ $X_c^2 = 12.5915$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the size of the school district and the manner in which appropriated monies would be used by music educators.

APPENDIX D

THE MUSIC TEACHER IN THE ELEMENTARY CLASSROOM

TABLES

1. Who actually teaches the elementary music in the classroom?

   A 12.1 Raw data

   B 12.1 Statistical analysis; proportional data

2. Who helps the general elementary classroom teacher who teaches her own music?

   A 12.2 Raw data

   B 12.2 Statistical analysis; proportional data

A 12.1
A 12.2

THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. In the elementary public schools, who actually teaches the classroom music? Is it a person trained in music, knowledgeable in music?
2. If it is not a music specialist, does the teacher get help from a specialist? From someone else in the building knowledgeable in music? From educational television?

Number of schools in the district	A 12.1 Who actually teaches the elementary music?				A 12.2 Who helps the general classroom teacher in her music program?					
	Regular classroom teacher	A music specialist	A music supervisor	A music coordinator	No help at all	Other classroom teacher	A music specialist	A music supervisor	A music coordinator	Educational television
1	25	79	4	5	11	2	6	1	1	1
2	8	29	2	1	5	1	1	0	0	0
3	9	23	0	0	3	0	1	2	0	0
4	8	17	1	1	3	0	1	0	0	0
5	9	15	0	1	1	0	5	0	1	0
6-10	47	40	1	0	10	1	21	3	5	0
11-25	29	35	0	1	10	0	12	4	1	0
26-50	17	3	0	0	2	1	8	2	3	0
51-100	12	3	0	0	2	0	6	2	0	0
Over 100	5	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0
Totals	169	246	8	9	46	5	64	16	11	1
	432				144					
Percentages	39.12	56.94	1.85	2.08	32.63	3.47	44.44	11.11	7.63	0.69

B 12.1 Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and who actually teaches the music in the classroom?

Music in the Elementary Classroom Is Taught by:

Number of schools in the district	Regular Classroom Teacher (%)	Music Specialist (%)	Total
1-3	42 (22.70)	143 (77.30)	185
4-10	64 (45.71)	76 (54.29)	140
11-25	29 (44.67)	36 (55.38)	65
26 and over	34 (80.95)	8 (19.05)	42
TOTALS	169 (39.12)	263 (60.88)	432

G = 56.7612 $X_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and who teaches the music program in the elementary schools.

B 12.2 (See next page.)

B 12.2 Is there any relationship between the size of the school district and the help that the classroom teacher (who teaches the music herself) gets from music specialists?

Is There Help for the Classroom Teacher Teaching Music?

Number of schools in the district	No Help (%)	Help (%)	Total
1-3	19 (54.29)	16 (45.71)	35
4-10	14 (27.45)	37 (72.55)	51
11-25	10 (37.04)	17 (62.96)	27
26 and over	4 (12.90)	27 (87.10)	31
TOTALS	47 (32.64)	97 (67.36)	144

G = 14.2550 $X_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the help that the classroom teacher (who teaches music herself) gets from music specialists.

APPENDIX E

MUSIC INSTRUCTION IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

TABLES

1. How much time is allotted for general elementary classroom music?

   A 13.1 Raw data

   B 13.1 No statistical analysis

   A 13.2 Raw data

   B 13.2 No statistical analysis

   A 13.3 Composite of raw data

   B 13.3 Statistical analysis; proportional data

2. What basic textbooks are being used to teach classroom music?

   A 14.1 Raw data

   B 14.1 No statistical analysis

3. Are correlated recordings being provided for the texts?

   A 15.1 Raw data

   B 15.1 Statistical analysis; proportional data

4. Are audio-visual materials being provided?

   A 15.2 Raw data

   B 15.2 No statistical analysis

5. Is music reading taught in the general music class?

   A 16.1 Raw data

   B 16.1 Statistical analysis; proportional data

6. By what method do the music educators state that they teach

music reading?

A 16.2 Raw data

B 16.2 No statistical analysis

7. In what grade does music reading in the classroom begin?

A 17.1 Raw data

B 17.1 Statistical analysis; proportional data

8. How often is music reading taught in the classroom?

A 17.2 Raw data

B 17.2 Statistical analysis; proportional data

9. Is instrumental training taught in the public schools?

A 18.1 Raw data

B 18.1 Statistical analysis; proportional data

10. In what grade does instrumental training begin in the schools?

A 18.2 Raw data

B 18.2 No statistical analysis

11. Is there a plan to have different instruments taught in different grades?

A 18.3 Raw data

B 18.3 Statistical analysis; proportional data

12. When are the different instruments begun?

A 18.4 Raw data

B 18.4 No statistical analysis

13. How are the instruments selected?

A 18.5 Raw data

B 18.5 No statistical analysis

14. What methods are used to teach instrumental training in the

public schools?

A 19.1 Raw data

B 19.1 No statistical analysis

15. Who teaches the instrumental training classes?

A 19.2 Raw data

B 19.2 No statistical analysis

16. How much time per week is given to instrumental training?

A 19.3 Raw data

B 19.3 Statistical analysis; proportional data

17. Is there a string program in the public schools?

A 20.1 Raw data

B 20.1 Statistical analysis; proportional data

18. Who teaches string instruments in the public schools?

A 20.2 Raw data

B 20.2 No statistical analysis

19. When are the string instruments taught in the public schools?

A 20.3 Raw data

B 20.3 No statistical analysis

20. Is there an elementary school orchestra in the public schools?

A 20.4 Raw data

B 20.4 Statistical analysis; proportional data

21. How does the number of orchestras compare with the number of bands in the elementary schools?

A 20.5 Raw data

B 20.5 No statistical analysis

22. How common is the existence of the elementary school band?

A 21.1 Raw data

B 21.1 Statistical analysis; proportional data

23. How often does the elementary band rehearse?

A 21.2 Raw data

B 21.2 Statistical analysis; proportional data

24. How often does the elementary band appear in public performance?

A 21.3 Raw data

B 21.3 Statistical analysis; proportional data

25. Is there a special choral program in the elementary school?

A 22.1 Raw data

B 22.1 Statistical analysis; proportional data

26. What grades participate in the elementary choral program?

A 22.2 Raw data

B 22.2 Statistical analysis; proportional data

27. Does the elementary chorus appear in public performance?

A 22.3 Raw data

B 22.3 No statistical analysis

28. How often does the elementary chorus appear in public?

A 22.4 Raw data

B 22.4 Statistical analysis; proportional data

A 13.1
A 13.2
A 13.3

THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. How much music are children in American elementary schools getting today?
2. Is there any relationship between the time allotted to music on the school schedule and the size of the district?

Number of schools in the district	A 13.1		A 13.2 Frequency of the lessons as reported																										A 13.3 Frequency of the music in the classroom			
			Twice Mo.	Once a week					Twice a week						Three times a week				Four/ week			Daily								Weekly time allotment in minutes			
	Frequency varies	Private lessons only	30 min.	20 min.	25 min.	30 min.	40 min.	45 min.	20 min.	25 min.	30 min.	40 min.	45 min.	60 min.	20 min.	30 min.	40 min.	60 min.	20 min.	30 min.	40 min.	15 min.	20 min.	25 min.	30 min.	40 min.	Acc. to bldg. principal	Irregular	No class instruction	20-40 min.	45-65 min.	70-90 min.	95+ min.
1	1	2	0	7	0	9	2	5	9	3	7	4	1	0	4	12	2	1	2	3	0	1	9	2	0	0	0	1	4	27	19	20	17
2	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	2	4	0	9	0	0	0	3	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	13	14	3	5
3	0	0	0	2	1	5	1	1	2	1	7	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	9	4	2
4	2	0	0	1	0	5	0	2	3	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	3	2
5	4	0	0	1	1	3	1	0	2	1	4	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	2	1
6-10	4	0	3	8	1	16	2	0	9	1	18	1	4	1	3	2	0	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	36	22	11	5
11-25	3	0	0	5	2	7	1	1	5	0	17	1	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	0	1	2	0	0	0	20	20	6	9
26-50	4	0	0	1	0	4	0	1	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	5	0	5
51-100	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	5	1	3	4
Over 100	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0
Totals	20	2	4	27	8	55	9	12	36	6	74	11	10	1	15	20	4	2	6	6	1	7	28	3	3	2	1	5	5	135	107	54	50
				111					138						41				13			43					11						
			361																											346			
Percentages			1.10	30.77					38.22						11.35				3.60			11.91					3.04			39.02	30.92	15.61	14.45

B 13.3 Is there any relationship between the time allotted to music on the school schedule and the size of the district?

Minutes of Music Instruction per Week

[illegible]ber of [illegible]ools in [illegible] district	20-40 (%)	45-65 (%)	70-90 (%)	95+ (%)	Total
1-3	61 (35.41)	42 (29.17)	27 (18.75)	24 (16.67)	144
4-10	53 (46.49)	37 (32.46)	16 (14.03)	8 (07.02)	114
11-25	20 (36.36)	20 (36.36)	6 (10.91)	9 (16.37)	55
26 and over	11 (33.33)	18 (24.24)	5 (15.15)	9 (27.28)	33
TOTALS	135 (39.02)	107 (30.92)	54 (15.61)	50 (14.45)	346

G = 14.5418 X_c^2 = 16.9190

The statistical analysis shows that at a 95% confidence level there is no significant relationship between the size of the school district and the number of minutes of classroom music instruction per week.

A 14.1 **THE BASIC QUESTIONS:**

1. What is the "first-named" basic textbook stated as being used to teach music in the public elementary schools of the U.S.?*

Number of schools in the district	A 14.1 Birchard Music Series (Summy-Birchard)	Discovering Music Together (Follett Educational Corp.)	Exploring Music (Holt, Rinehart & Winston)	Growing with Music (Prentice-Hall)	Music of Music (Ginn and Co.)	Making Music Your Own (Silver Burdett)	Music for Young Americans (American Book Co.)	New Dimensions in Music (American Book Co.)	This is Music (Allyn and Bacon)	Own text	Several or many texts	
	BMS	DMT	EM	GM	MM	MMYO	MYA	NDM	TIM			NA
1	1	7	16	4	10	16	8	0	1	0	11	22
2	0	0	5	0	2	14	0	1	4	0	2	11
3	0	0	6	0	0	8	2	0	2	0	2	10
4	0	0	3	2	1	7	1	0	1	0	2	4
5	0	1	3	1	1	5	1	0	1	0	3	6
6-10	0	3	10	3	0	26	5	1	1	1	9	9
11-25	0	5	7	1	0	17	2	0	0	1	15	5
26-50	0	1	3	0	0	4	1	0	1	0	1	3
51-100	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	2
Over 100	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1
Totals	1	17	59	11	15	97	20	2	12	2	55	73
	361											
Percentages	0.70	4.71	16.34	3.05	4.16	26.86	5.54	0.55	3.32	0.55	15.24	19.3

---

*Some respondents named several texts; some said several or many texts.

A 15.1
A 15.2

THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. Are the schools providing correlated recordings for the texts being used?
2. Are the schools providing audio-visual materials for elementary music education?
3. Is there a relationship between the size of the district and the supplementary materials being provided?

Number of schools in the district	A 15.1 Correlated recordings				A 15.2 Audio-visual materials			
	NA	Not provided	Yes, provided	Some provided	NA	Not provided	Yes, provided	Some provided
1	22	21	67	9	44	26	33	14
2	7	10	22	4	11	11	13	8
3	3	4	22	3	11	4	15	2
4	5	5	17	1	11	5	9	3
5	4	3	18	1	6	6	12	2
6-10	9	9	68	2	27	11	40	9
11-25	7	3	50	4	18	1	37	10
26-50	1	2	18	1	6	0	13	3
51-100	1	2	11	1	4	1	8	2
Over 100	1	0	7	0	1	0	6	1
Totals	60	59	300	26	139	65	186	54
	445				444			
Percentages	13.48	13.25	67.41	5.84	31.30	14.63	41.69	12.16

B 15.1 Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and correlated recordings available to the elementary classroom music teacher?

Recordings That Match the Text Available

Number of schools in the district	No (%)	Yes (%)	Total
1-3	35 (21.60)	127 (78.40)	162
4-10	17 (13.71)	107 (86.29)	124
11-25	3 (05.26)	54 (94.74)	57
26 and over	4 (09.52)	38 (90.48)	42
TOTALS	59 (15.32)	326 (84.68)	385

$G = 11.6691$ $\quad X_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the availability of correlated recordings.

A 16.1
A 16.2

THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. Are boys and girls being taught to read music in the elementary schools?
2. What methods do the respondents report they are using?
3. Is there any relationship between the methods and the size of the district?

Number of schools in the district	A 16.1 Is music reading taught?			A 16.2 Number of different ideas used to express method of teaching music reading								
	NA	No	Yes	Moveable "do"/ Syllables	Richards and/or Kodály	Letters	Numbers	Rote to note	Using instruments	Combined methods	Non-descript	Other
1	7	16	94	5	18	2	3	18	3	5	17	3
2	0	9	33	3	8	0	1	4	1	1	8	1
3	4	7	22	2	8	0	0	2	0	2	2	0
4	1	2	25	2	12	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
5	5	1	20	2	7	0	0	1	1	1	3	0
6-10	3	8	77	4	20	1	1	1	5	8	12	0
11-25	5	6	56	8	12	1	1	6	3	10	9	1
26-50	1	1	19	1	3	1	1	3	2	3	0	1
51-100	0	1	14	0	1	0	1	3	0	4	5	0
Over 100	1	0	7	1	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	0
Totals	27	51	367	28	90	6	8	40	15	36	58	6
		445						287				
Percentages	6.07	11.46	82.47	9.76	31.36	2.09	2.79	13.94	5.23	12.54	20.21	2.09

B 16.1 Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and the teaching of music reading in classroom music?

Is Music Reading Taught in Your Classroom Music Program?

Number of schools in the district	No (%)	Yes (%)	Total
1-3	32 (17.68)	149 (82.32)	181
4-10	11 (08.27)	122 (91.73)	133
11-25	6 (09.68)	56 (90.32)	62
26 and over	2 (04.76)	40 (95.24)	42
TOTALS	51 (12.20)	367 (87.80)	418

G = 9.8043 $X_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the teaching of music reading in classroom music.

A 17.1
A 17.2

THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. In what grade do respondents report they start the teaching of music reading?
2. How often is music reading taught each week?

Number of schools in the district	A 17.1 In what grade does music reading begin in the classroom?								A 17.2 How often each week?					
	NA	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Daily	Varies	Three times a week	Two times a week	Once a week	NA
1	5	4	31	14	16	13	4	1	7	5	17	17	15	21
2	2	2	10	8	3	4	3	0	4	1	1	10	10	6
3	4	3	6	4	4	0	0	1	1	1	0	5	5	7
4	0	1	14	3	2	2	0	1	1	5	0	7	0	8
5	1	2	7	6	1	4	0	0	1	3	3	3	3	6
6-10	11	1	6	16	11	6	2	1	3	6	1	17	20	25
11-25	6	1	23	9	9	6	1	0	5	5	3	10	13	17
26-50	2	1	4	6	3	3	0	0	1	4	0	1	5	8
51-100	0	1	9	1	2	1	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	8
Over 100	0	2	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
Totals	31	18	110	69	52	40	10	4	25	32	26	73	72	109
	334								337					
Percentages	9.28	5.39	32.93	20.66	15.57	11.98	2.99	1.20	7.42	9.50	7.72	21.66	21.36	32.34

B 17.1 Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and when music reading is taught?

Music Reading Is Begun in:

Number of schools in the district	K or 1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4, 5, or 6 (%)	Total
1-3	56 (42.75)	26 (19.85)	23 (17.55)	26 (19.85)	131
4-10	31 (36.05)	25 (29.07)	14 (16.28)	16 (18.60)	86
11-25	24 (58.98)	9 (18.37)	9 (18.37)	7 (14.28)	49
26 and over	17 (45.95)	9 (24.32)	6 (16.22)	5 (13.51)	37
TOTALS	128 (42.25)	69 (22.77)	52 (17.16)	54 (17.82)	303

G = 5.0461 $X_c^2 = 16.9190$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the size of the school district and the grade during which music reading starts.

B 17.2 Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and how frequently music reading is taught on a weekly basis?

How Often Each Week Is Music Reading Taught?

Number of schools in the district	4 or 5 Times/Week	2 or 3 Times/Week	Once Per Week	Varies	Total
1-3	12 (12.12)	50 (50.51)	30 (30.30)	7 (07.07)	99
4-10	5 (06.85)	31 (42.46)	23 (31.51)	14 (19.18)	73
11-25	5 (13.89)	13 (36.11)	13 (36.11)	5 (13.89)	36
26 and over	3 (15.00)	5 (25.00)	6 (30.00)	6 (30.00)	20
TOTALS	25 (10.96)	99 (43.42)	72 (31.58)	32 (14.04)	228

G = 13.8106 $X_c^2 = 16.9190$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the size of the school district and how frequently music reading is taught each week in classroom music.

A 18.1
A 18.2
A 18.3
A 18.4
A 18.5

THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. Are the public schools of the U.S. teaching children to play instruments during school time?
2. At what grade level do they begin to teach instrumental training? How do they decide what instrument the child will study?

Number of schools in the district	A 18.1 Is instrumental training taught?			A 18.2 In what grade does it begin?					A 18.3 Are different instruments begun in different grades?			A 18.4 When are the instruments begun?												A 18.5 How are they selected?		
	NA	No	Yes	2	3	4	5	6	NA	Yes	No	Strings in 1	Strings in 2	Strings in 3	Strings in 4	Strings in 5	Woodwinds in 3	Woodwinds in 4	Woodwinds in 5	Woodwinds in 6	Brass in 4	Brass in 5	Brass in 6	Children select	Other ways	NA
1	3	20	96	0	2	42	44	9	26	21	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	1	4	1	6	8	7
2	1	7	35	0	3	9	20	3	5	5	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	2
3	3	2	28	0	0	14	10	4	8	5	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
4	0	8	22	0	3	4	11	1	3	3	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
5	0	2	22	0	1	19	6	1	3	6	13	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
6-10	0	12	76	3	5	32	30	7	16	21	39	1	0	3	8	1	0	2	9	1	2	7	2	0	4	3
11-25	0	10	56	2	2	31	14	4	10	24	22	0	0	1	11	1	0	1	12	1	1	12	1	0	0	0
26-50	0	3	19	0	1	9	5	3	4	8	6	0	0	1	5	1	0	1	4	1	0	5	1	0	0	0
51-100	0	0	14	0	2	8	1	3	0	5	8	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0
Over 100	1	0	7	0	1	5	1	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	10	65	375	5	20	173	142	35	76	98	196	1	0	8	30	4	0	9	35	3	7	33	5	6	16	18
	450			375					372			43					47				45			40		
Percentages	2.22	14.44	83.33	1.33	5.33	46.13	37.87	9.33	20.43	26.34	53.23	2.32	0	18.60	69.76	9.30	0	19.14	81.39	6.97	15.55	73.33	11.11	15.00	40.00	45.00

B 18.1 Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and the existence of instrumental training classes?

Is Instrumental Training Taught in Your District?

Number of schools in the district	No (%)	Yes (%)	Total
1-3	29 (15.43)	59 (84.57)	188
4-10	22 (15.49)	120 (84.51)	142
11-25	10 (15.15)	56 (84.85)	66
26 and over	4 (09.09)	40 (90.91)	44
TOTALS	65 (14.77)	375 (85.23)	440

G = 1.4071 $X_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the size of the school district and the existence of instrumental training classes.

B 18.3 (See next page.)

B 18.3 Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and the existence of an instrumental training plan whereby different instruments are started at different grades?

Are Different Instruments Begun at Different Grades?

Number of schools in the district	Yes (%)	No (%)	Total
1-3	31 (25.62)	90 (74.38)	121
4-10	30 (31.25)	66 (68.75)	96
11-25	24 (52.17)	22 (47.83)	46
26 and over	13 (39.39)	20 (60.61)	33
TOTALS	98 (33.11)	198 (66.89)	296

G = 10.9944 $X_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and a plan or program whereby different instruments are started at different grades.

A 19.1
A 19.2
A 19.3

THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. By what methods are the children being taught to play instruments in the public schools?
2. Who teaches the instruments to the children?
3. How much time is given to instrumental training class each week? How often do the classes meet?

Number of schools in the district	A 19.1 Method used for instrumental training: instrumental training book is named											A 19.2 Who teaches instr. training?			A 19.3 How many hours per week for instrumental training?								
	NA	Small group	Individual instruction	Belwin	Suzuki	Various methods	Rubank	Leonard	Combined methods	Other single listings	Kinyon	NA	Vocal specialist	Instrumental specialist	NA	One-half	Three-quarters	One	One and one-half	Two	Three	Four	Five
1	[illegible]6	1	2	26	0	5	1	1	0	1	0	21	10	71	28	29	8	8	8	8	7	2	3
2	24	1	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	33	8	7	2	7	3	6	1	2	1
3	15	2	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	24	8	9	3	3	0	3	1	0	0
4	14	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	17	9	6	0	3	0	1	1	1	0
5	13	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	6	0	16	4	10	0	6	0	1	1	0	0
6-10	36	0	3	11	1	8	0	0	4	7	2	12	2	69	23	29	8	17	5	3	1	1	0
11-25	32	0	0	6	2	9	0	1	0	6	1	7	0	51	15	22	5	11	3	3	0	0	0
26-50	10	1	0	2	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	17	5	3	2	6	1	1	0	1	0
51-100	2	0	1	2	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	2	4	2	2	3	0	0	1	0
Over 100	3	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	5	3	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0
Totals	215	5	10	68	3	42	1	2	5	24	4	63	13	316	105	121	30	64	25	26	12	8	4
	411											392			395								
Percentages	52.31	1.21	2.43	16.55	0.73	10.20	0.24	0.49	1.21	5.84	0.97	16.07	3.32	80.61	26.58	30.63	7.59	16.20	6.32	6.58	3.03	2.02	1.01

*In some cases different instruments had different time allotments. All are included here.

B 19.3 Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and how much time is given to instrumental training classes?

How Many Hours Per Week for Instrumental Training?

Number of schools in the district	1/2 (%)	3/4 (%)	1 (%)	1 1/2 or more (%)	Total
1-3	45 (37.19)	13 (10.74)	18 (14.88)	45 (37.19)	121
4-10	45 (47.87)	8 (08.51)	26 (27.66)	15 (15.96)	94
11-25	22 (50.00)	5 (11.36)	11 (25.00)	6 (13.64)	44
26 and over	9 (29.03)	4 (12.91)	9 (29.03)	9 (29.03)	31
TOTALS	121 (41.72)	30 (10.35)	64 (22.07)	75 (25.86)	290

$G = 21.8510$ $X_c^2 = 16.9190$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the amount of time per week devoted to instrumental training.

A 20.1
A 20.2
A 20.3
A 20.4

THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. American symphony orchestras are in need of string players; are the elementary schools of the U.S. teaching children to play string instruments?
2. Who teaches the strings? When are they taught? Are there elementary school orchestras?

Number of schools in the district	A 20.1 Is there a string program?			A 20.2 Who teaches the strings?			A 20.3 When are the strings taught?				A 20.4 Is there an elementary orchestra?		
	NA	No	Yes	Specialist in strings	Band instructor	Other	NA	During school time	After school	Other	NA	Yes	No
1	18	96	4	2	0	2	116	2	0	0	45	5	68
2	3	38	2	1	0	1	41	2	0	0	10	2	31
3	7	19	6	5	0	0	27	0	0	5	10	4	18
4	6	15	7	4	0	3	22	4	1	1	14	3	11
5	3	15	8	4	1	3	20	2	0	4	6	5	15
6-10	9	40	40	27	0	14	57	19	0	12	14	30	45
11-25	8	17	41	28	0	10	35	14	0	17	6	40	20
26-50	1	1	20	16	0	4	11	6	0	5	2	11	9
51-100	2	1	12	6	0	6	5	4	0	6	1	13	1
Over 100	2	2	4	2	0	2	4	1	1	1	4	4	0
Totals	59	244	144	95	1	45	338	54	2	51	112	117	218
	447			141			445				447		
Percentages	13.20	54.59	32.21	67.37	0.71	31.91	75.95	12.13	0.44	11.46	25.06	26.17	48.77

B 20.1 Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and the existence of a string program?

Is There a String Program?

Number of schools in the district	No (%)	Yes (%)	Total
1-3	153 (92.72)	12 (07.27)	165
4-10	70 (56.00)	55 (44.00)	125
11-25	17 (29.31)	41 (70.69)	58
26 and over	4 (10.00)	36 (90.00)	40
TOTALS	244 (62.89)	144 (37.11)	388

G = 158.1422 $X^2_c = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a very strong relationship between the size of the school district and the existence of a string program in the district.

B 20.4 Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and the existence of an elementary orchestra?

Is There an Elementary Orchestra?

Number of schools in the district	Yes (%)	No (%)	Total
1-3	11 (08.59)	117 (91.41)	128
4-10	38 (34.86)	71 (65.14)	109
11-25	40 (66.67)	20 (33.33)	60
26 and over	28 (73.68)	10 (26.32)	38
TOTALS	117 (34.93)	218 (65.07)	335

G = 97.3217 $X^2_c = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a very significant relationship between the size of the school district and the existence of an elementary orchestra.

A 20.3 **THE BASIC QUESTIONS:**

1. Are there still many more bands than orchestras in the elementary schools of the U.S.?
2. Is the size of the school district a factor in the existence of band as related to orchestra?

Number of schools in the district	A 20.3 Elementary orchestra			Elementary band		
	NA	Yes	No	NA	Yes	No
1	45	2	68	39	68	11
2	10	2	31	8	29	6
3	10	4	18	10	19	3
4	14	3	11	10	13	5
5	6	5	15	5	17	4
6-10	14	30	45	10	64	15
11-25	6	40	20	10	38	18
26-50	2	11	9	3	10	9
51-100	1	13	1	2	12	1
Over 100	4	4	0	4	3	1
Totals	112	117	218	101	273	73
		447			447	
Percentages	25.06	26.17	48.77	22.60	61.07	16.33

A 21.1
A 21.2
A 21.3

THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. Are there elementary bands in the schools of the U.S.?
2. How much time is allowed for training the band?
3. How often does it make public appearances?

Number of schools in the district	A 21.1 Elementary band			A 21.2 Frequency of band rehearsals			A 21.3 Frequency of public appearances	
	NA	Yes	No	Weekly	Twice weekly	More than twice weekly	Two times a year	More frequently
1	39	68	11	16	19	31	47	14
2	8	29	6	7	6	12	21	7
3	10	19	3	6	7	5	17	1
4	10	13	5	5	4	4	11	2
5	5	17	4	5	6	4	13	2
6-10	10	64	15	26	21	10	48	11
11-25	10	38	18	24	9	2	30	5
26-50	3	10	9	5	4	1	6	3
51-100	2	12	1	8	3	0	7	4
Over 100	4	3	1	2	1	0	2	1
Totals	101	273	73	104	80	59	202	50
	447			253			252	
Percentages	22.60	61.07	16.33	41.11	31.62	27.27	80.15	19.84

B 21.1 Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and the existence of an elementary school band?

Is There an Elementary Band?

Number of schools in the district	Yes (%)	No (%)	Total
1-3	116 (85.29)	20 (14.70)	136
4-10	94 (79.66)	24 (20.33)	118
11-25	38 (67.85)	18 (32.14)	56
26 and over	25 (69.44)	11 (30.55)	36
TOTALS	273 (78.90)	73 (21.10)	346

$G = 9.1361$ $\chi_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the existence of an elementary band.

B 21.2 Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and the frequency with which the band rehearsals occur?

How Frequently Does the Band Rehearse?

Number of schools in the district	Once Per Week (%)	Twice or More Per Week (%)	Total
1-3	29 (26.61)	80 (73.39)	109
4-10	36 (42.35)	49 (57.65)	85
11-25	24 (68.57)	11 (31.43)	35
26 and over	15 (62.50)	9 (37.50)	24
TOTALS	104 (41.11)	149 (58.89)	253

$G = 25.2313$ $\chi_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the frequency with which band rehearsals occur.

B 21.3 Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and the frequency with which the elementary band makes public appearances?

How Often Does the Band Appear in Public?

Number of schools in the district	Twice a Year (%)	Three or More Times a Year (%)	Total
1-3	85 (79.44)	22 (20.56)	107
4-10	72 (82.76)	15 (17.24)	87
11-25	30 (85.71)	5 (14.29)	35
26 and over	15 (65.22)	8 (34.78)	23
TOTALS	202 (80.16)	50 (19.84)	252

G = 3.9461 $X_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the size of the school district and the frequency with which the band appears in public.

A 22.1 **THE BASIC QUESTIONS:**
A 22.2
A 22.3 1. Are there special choral programs in the elementary schools of the U.S.?
A 22.4 2. What grades participate in these choral programs? Do they appear in public?

Number of schools in the district	A 22.1 Is there a special choral program?			A 22.2 What grades participate?							A 22.3 Do they make public appearances?			A 22.4 How often?							
	NA	No	Yes	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	NA	No	Yes	NA	Annually	Semi-annually	Three or four times a year	Other	Five to seven times a year	More than eight times a year	Varies
1	5	61	53	8	11	0	3	11	17	4	0	0	53	0	9	21	16	1	1	0	0
2	2	21	18	3	3	0	1	5	6	1	0	0	18	2	1	10	4	0	0	3	3
3	2	15	17	1	0	0	0	9	5	2	0	0	17	0	1	12	2	0	1	0	1
4	1	7	20	0	0	1	3	6	7	3	0	0	20	0	3	11	3	1	1	0	1
5	0	10	15	1	1	0	0	6	6	1	0	0	15	1	3	8	0	2	1	0	1
6-10	3	33	53	4	1	1	1	17	23	6	1	0	52	2	3	25	10	7	2	0	4
11-25	3	19	43	3	0	0	1	11	17	10	1	1	41	1	10	16	11	3	2	0	0
26-50	1	5	16	1	0	0	1	6	5	2	0	0	16	1	1	7	1	1	0	0	5
51-100	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	9	1	0	3	1	0	1	0	3
Over 100	2	1	5	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	5	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	2
Totals	19	178	249	22	16	2	10	77	92	29	2	1	246	8	32	114	50	15	9	3	20
	446			248							249			251							
Percentages	4.26	39.91	55.83	8.87	6.45	0.81	4.03	31.05	37.10	11.69	0.80	0.40	98.80	3.19	12.75	45.42	13.92	5.98	3.59	1.20	7.97

B 22.1 Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and the existence of a choral program?

Do You Have an Elementary Choral Program?

Number of schools in the district	No (%)	Yes (%)	Total
1-3	96 (52.17)	88 (47.83)	184
4-10	50 (36.23)	88 (63.77)	138
11-25	19 (30.65)	43 (69.35)	62
26 and over	12 (28.57)	30 (71.43)	42
TOTALS	177 (41.55)	249 (58.45)	426

G = 16.2277 $X_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the existence of an elementary choral program.

B 22.2 Is there any relationship between the size of the school district and what grades participate in the elementary choral program?

What Grades Participate?

Number of schools in the district	K, 1, 2, & 3 (%)	4 (%)	5 & 6 (%)	Total
1-3	30 (33.33)	25 (27.78)	35 (38.89)	90
4-10	13 (14.77)	29 (32.96)	46 (52.27)	88
11-25	4 (09.52)	11 (26.19)	27 (64.29)	42
26 and over	3 (10.71)	12 (42.86)	13 (46.43)	28
TOTALS	50 (20.16)	77 (31.05)	121 (48.79)	248

G = 18.2405 $X_c^2 = 12.5916$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and the grades that participate in the elementary choral program.

B 22.4 Is there a relationship between the size of the school district and the number of public performances given by the elementary choral group?

How Frequently Does Your Choral Group Appear in Public?

Number of schools in the district	1 or 2 Times a Year (%)	3 or 4 Times a Year (%)	Over 4 Times a Year (%)	Total
1-3	54 (62.79)	22 (25.58)	10 (11.63)	86
4-10	53 (61.63)	13 (15.12)	20 (23.25)	86
11-25	26 (61.90)	11 (26.19)	5 (11.91)	42
26 and over	13 (43.33)	5 (16.67)	12 (40.00)	30
TOTALS	146 (59.84)	51 (20.90)	47 (19.26)	244

G = 15.040 $X_c^2 = 12.5916$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the size of the school district and how frequently the elementary choral groups give public performances.

APPENDIX F

PRIMARY GOALS AS RELATED TO OTHER FACTORS

TABLES

1. Are the primary goals related to the selected texts?

   A 23.1 Raw data

   B 23.1 No statistical analysis

2. Is there a relationship between the stated primary goals and classroom music taught by the classroom teacher?

   A 24.1 Raw data

   B 24.1 Statistical analysis; proportional data

3. Is there a relationship between the stated primary goals and classroom music taught by a special music teacher?

   A 24.2 Raw data

   B 24.2 No statistical analysis

4. Is there a relationship between the stated primary goals and classroom music taught by a music supervisor?

   A 24.3 Raw data

   B 24.3 No statistical analysis

5. Is there a relationship between the stated primary goals and classroom music taught by a music coordinator?

   A 24.4 Raw data

   B 24.4 No statistical analysis

6. Is there a relationship between the stated primary goals and classroom music where there was no answer given or some other

music educator was mentioned?

A 24.5 Raw data

B 24.5 No statistical analysis

7. Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals and the teaching of music reading?

A 25.1 Raw data

B 25.1 Statistical analysis; proportional data

8. Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals and the method by which music reading is taught?

A 25.2 Raw data

B 25.2 No statistical analysis

9. Is there a relationship between the stated primary goals and the existence of an instrumental training program?

A 26.1 Raw data

B 26.1 Statistical analysis; proportional data

10. Is there a relationship between the stated primary goals and the grade level at which the instrumental training program begins?

A 26.2 Raw data

B 26.2 Statistical analysis; proportional data

11. Is there a relationship between the stated primary goals and the plan to offer different instruments at different grades?

A 26.3 Raw data

B 26.3 Statistical analysis; proportional data

12. Does the training on some instruments start earlier than on others?

A 26.4 Raw data

B 26.4 No statistical analysis

13. Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals and the existence of a string program in the schools?

A 27.1 Raw data

B 27.1 Statistical analysis; proportional data

14. Is there a relationship between the stated primary goals and "who" teaches the string program?

A 27.2 Raw data

B 27.2 Statistical analysis; proportional data

15. Is there a relationship between the stated primary goals and the existence of an elementary orchestra in the music program?

A 27.3 Raw data

B 27.3 Statistical analysis; proportional data

A 23.1 THE BASIC QUESTION:

1. Is there a relationship between the respondents' statements of their primary goals and the series or text being used in the classroom music?

Stated primary goal	A 23.1* Number of respondents	Birchard Music Series	Discovering Music Together	Exploring Music	Growing with Music	Magic of Music	Making Music Your Own	Music for Young Americans	New Dimensions In Music	This Is Music	Whatever text the state adopts	Many or various texts		No text used	Other, e.g., Kodaly, Orff
		BMS	DMT	EM	GM	MM	MMYO	MYA	NDM	TIM			NA		
A	88	0	8	16	5	13	24	4	3	7	5	8	10	3	6
B	13	0	0	2	1	1	5	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3
C	89	2	11	13	7	12	38	3	4	10	3	19	19	1	12
D	51	0	2	8	3	3	22	3	5	2	5	2	9	3	6
E	51	0	5	6	2	7	17	3	3	3	2	3	5	6	0
F	10	0	3	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	0
G	5	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
H	39	0	6	10	6	2	20	1	4	5	2	1	7	0	0
I	9	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	0
J	7	0	2	2	1	1	4	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1
K	6	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
No goal stated	80	0	4	9	5	3	32	5	0	5	5	5	14	2	3
Totals	448	2	43	70	30	42	172	21	19	34	24	46	73	19	41
		636													
Percentages		0.31	6.76	11.00	4.71	6.60	27.04	3.30	2.98	5.34	3.77	7.23	11.47	2.98	6.44

*This chart differs from the tabulations reported on charts A 14.1 and following. In the earlier charts, only the "first-named" text was recorded; in this chart, all named texts are recorded.

A 24.1
A 24.2
A 24.3
A 24.4
A 24.5

THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals and the person who actually teaches the classroom music?
2. Are there more specialists in music teaching classroom music with particular primary goals?

Stated primary goal	Number of respondents	Who teaches classroom music? A 24.1 The regular classroom teacher?			A 24.2 A special music teacher?			A 24.3 A music supervisor?			A 24.4 A music coordinator?			A 24.5	
		No	Some	Only	No	Some	Only	No	Some	Only	No	Some	Only	NA	Other
A	88	49	20	18	21	22	44	83	3	1	86	1	0	1	0
B	13	7	5	1	2	5	6	10	3	0	11	2	0	0	0
C	89	59	23	7	17	19	53	82	4	3	85	4	0	0	1
D	51	23	22	6	0	22	21	44	7	0	48	3	0	0	0
E	51	39	8	4	10	9	32	46	4	1	43	5	3	0	0
F	10	7	2	1	2	3	5	9	1	0	8	1	1	0	0
G	5	3	1	1	1	1	3	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
H	39	16	14	9	0	11	16	36	3	0	37	2	0	0	0
I	9	5	3	0	2	1	5	7	1	0	7	1	0	1	0
J	7	2	3	2	2	3	2	7	0	0	7	0	0	0	0
K	6	3	3	0	0	3	3	6	0	0	6	0	0	0	0
No goal stated	80	43	13	21	26	14	37	73	4	0	70	3	4	3	1
Totals	448	256	117	70	83	113	227	408	30	5	413	22	8	5	2
	-	443			423			443			443				
Percentages		57.78	26.41	15.80	19.62	26.71	53.66	92.10	6.77	1.15	93.22	4.96	1.80		

B 24.1 Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals and the teacher of classroom music, i.e., whether it is a regular classroom teacher, a music specialist, etc.?

Is It the Classroom Teacher?

Stated goals	No (%)	Sometimes (%)	Solely (%)	Total
I (A-B-C-D)	135 (57.50)	70 (29.16)	32 (13.33)	240
II (E-F-G)	49 (74.24)	11 (16.66)	6 (09.09)	66
III (H-I)	21 (44.68)	17 (36.17)	9 (19.15)	47
IV (J-K)	5 (38.46)	6 (46.15)	2 (15.39)	13
TOTALS	213 (58.20)	104 (28.41)	49 (13.39)	366

$G = 13.3307$ $X_c^2 = 12.5416$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the stated primary goals and who teaches the classroom music.

A 25.1
A 25.2

THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. Is there any relationship between the primary goals of the district and the teaching of music reading?
2. What relationship, if any, exists between the method used to teach music reading and the stated primary goals?

Stated primary goal	Number of respondents	A 25.1 Is music reading taught?			A 25.2 By what method is music reading taught?										
		NA	No	Yes*	Fixed "do"	Moveable "do"	Kodály and/or Richards	Letters	Numbers	Rote to note	Using instruments	Combined methods	Non-descript#	Other#	None stated
A	88	6	11	71	0	9	15	5	5	4	5	4	7	6	16
B	13	1	0	12	0	3	5	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1
C	89	7	5	77	1	10	26	1	6	7	1	4	5	14	12
D	51	2	1	48	0	10	11	5	7	2	5	2	2	7	7
E	51	1	4	46	1	5	13	1	3	2	1	4	5	7	9
F	10	1	2	7	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	3
G	5	0	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
H	39	2	5	31	0	3	10	3	0	4	0	3	4	2	4
I	9	0	2	7	0	1	3	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0
J	7	0	0	7	0	2	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1
K	6	0	0	6	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
No goal stated	80	12	16	52	0	6	12	1	4	0	1	3	4	4	21
Totals	448	32	48	367	2	52	101	16	28	23	16	23	28	43	74
		447			406										
Percentages		7.15	10.73	82.10	0.49	12.80	24.87	3.94	6.89	5.66	3.94	5.06	6.89	10.59	18.22

---

*Includes "very little," "sometimes," "by hook or by crook," etc.

#Includes naming of a text, "my own," "by sight," "by lecture," etc.

B 25.1 Is there a relationship between the stated primary goals of the music educators and the teaching of music reading?

Is Music Reading Taught?

Stated goals	No (%)	Yes (%)	Total
I (A-B-C-D)	17 (07.56)	208 (92.44)	225
II (E-F-G)	8 (12.50)	56 (87.50)	64
III (H-I)	7 (15.56)	38 (84.44)	45
IV (J-K)	0	13 (100.0)	13
TOTALS	32 (09.22)	315 (90.78)	347

G = 5.8765 $X_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the stated primary goals and the fact that music reading was or was not taught. No further analysis was made related to the materials charted regarding music reading and stated goals. There were too many low frequencies for valid analysis.

A 26.1 **THE BASIC QUESTIONS:**
A 26.2
A 26.3 1. Is there a relationship between the instrumental training program and the stated primary goals of the respondents?
A 26.4 2. Is there any relationship between the primary goals and the grades in which the students begin different instruments?

Stated primary goal	Number of respondents	A 26.1 Is instrumental training taught?			A 26.2 In what grade does it begin?					A 26.3 Are different instruments taught in different grades?			A 26.4 Are some instruments begun earlier than others?													
													String Instruments					Woodwind Instruments			Brass Instruments			Children select	Other methods	
		NA	No	Yes	2	3	4	5	6	NA	Yes	No	1	2	3	4	5	4	5	6	4	5	6			NA
A	88	0	10	79	0	4	32	28	8	11	27	39	0	0	4	7	0	3	9	0	2	9	0	4	12	5
B	13	0	1	12	0	0	4	6	2	3	6	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	2	1
C	89	5	11	68	0	6	28	28	4	15	23	29	0	0	3	10	0	2	13	0	0	13	0	3	7	4
D	51	1	4	46	0	3	20	18	2	12	12	22	0	0	1	4	0	1	3	1	1	3	1	1	3	4
E	51	1	7	43	0	1	16	21	4	6	6	30	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4	0
F	10	0	0	10	0	2	3	3	2	4	3	3	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
G	5	0	2	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
H	39	0	8	32	1	2	17	7	3	8	9	16	0	0	1	4	0	1	4	0	1	4	0	0	1	3
I	9	0	1	8	0	0	0	6	1	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
J	7	0	0	7	0	0	6	0	1	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
K	6	0	1	5	0	0	3	2	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No goal stated	80	3	14	63	0	1	22	30	7	20	7	36	0	0	0	4	1	0	3	2	0	3	5	0	1	4
Totals	418	10	59	376	1	19	154	149	34	64	96	192	1	0	10	33	3	8	37	3	5	37	6	13	32	22
		445			357					372			210													
Percentages		2.24	13.25	84.49	0.28	5.32	43.13	41.73	9.52	22.58	25.80	51.61	0.47	0	4.76	15.71	1.42	3.80	17.61	1.42	2.38	17.61	2.85	6.19	15.23	10.47

B 26.1 Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals of the respondents and the instrumental training program?

Is Instrumental Training Taught?

Stated goals	No (%)	Yes (%)	Total
I (A-B-C-D)	29 (12.39)	205 (87.61)	234
II (E-F-G)	9 (13.85)	56 (86.15)	65
III (H-I)	9 (18.37)	40 (81.63)	49
IV (J-K)	1 (07.69)	12 (92.31)	13
TOTALS	48 (13.30)	313 (86.70)	361

G = 1.5885 X_c^2 = 7.81473

The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the stated primary goals and the existence of an instrumental training program in the district.

B 26.2 Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals and when the instrumental training program begins?

In What Grade Does Instrumental Training Begin?

Stated goals	2-3-4 (%)	5-6 (%)	Total
I (A-B-C-D)	97 (50.26)	96 (49.74)	193
II (E-F-G)	25 (45.45)	30 (54.55)	55
III (H-I)	19 (52.78)	17 (47.22)	36
IV (J-K)	9 (75.00)	3 (25.00)	12
TOTALS	150 (50.68)	146 (49.32)	196

G = 3.6570 X_c^2 = 7.81473

The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the stated primary goals and when the instrumental training program begins.

B 26.3 Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals and the plan to offer different instruments at different grades?

Are Different Instruments Taught in Different Grades?

Stated goals	Yes (%)	No (%)	Total
I (A-B-C-D)	68 (42.24)	93 (57.76)	161
II (E-F-G)	11 (24.44)	34 (75.56)	45
III (H-I)	10 (34.48)	19 (65.52)	29
IV (J-K)	0	10 (100.0)	10
TOTALS	89 (36.33)	156 (63.67)	245

G = 14.3723 $\quad$ $X_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the stated primary goals and the plan to offer different instruments in different grades in the instrumental training programs. A higher proportion of those who stated their goals are I (A-B-C-D) say "Yes," that their instrumental training program offers different instruments at different grade levels. The highest proportion of those who say "No," they do not teach the different instruments in different grades was indicated by those who stated their goals as IV (J-K).

A 27.1
A 27.2
A 27.3

THE BASIC QUESTIONS:

1. Is there any relationship between the primary goal of the music education program and the existence of a string program in the school?
2. Does the primary goal have anything to do with "who" teaches the strings? With the existence of an elementary school orchestra?

Stated primary goal	Number of respondents	A 27.1 Is there a special string program?			A 27.2 Who teaches it?					A 27.3 Is there an elementary orchestra?				
		NA	No	Yes	NA	String teacher	Instru-mental specialist	Band man	Other	NA	No	Yes	Some schools	Before each program
A	88	9	53	27	59	14	8	0	3	27	38	21	1	1
B	13	2	8	3	11	0	2	0	0	4	6	3	0	0
C	89	12	48	28	61	14	7	0	6	16	52	18	2	0
D	51	3	31	17	34	7	7	0	3	8	29	12	2	0
E	51	7	35	10	41	3	5	1	1	13	30	8	0	0
F	10	0	9	1	9	0	1	0	0	1	7	2	0	0
G	5	1	2	2	3	0	2	0	0	1	3	0	1	0
H	39	2	17	20	19	6	8	0	6	4	20	14	1	0
I	9	0	6	3	6	1	0	0	2	1	5	3	0	0
J	7	2	2	3	4	1	1	0	1	2	3	2	0	0
K	6	0	5	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0
No goal stated	80	14	38	28	55	7	13	1	4	29	28	22	1	0
Totals	448	52	254	143	308	53	54	2	26	107	225	106	8	1
		449			443					447				
Percentages		11.58	56.57	31.85	69.52	11.96	12.19	0.45	5.87	23.94	50.33	23.71	1.79	0.22

B 27.1 Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals of the music education program and the existence of a string program in the district?

Is There a Special String Program?

Stated goals	No (%)	Yes (%)	Total
I (A-B-C-D)	140 (65.12)	75 (34.88)	215
II (E-F-G)	46 (77.97)	13 (22.03)	59
III (H-I)	23 (50.00)	23 (50.00)	46
IV (J-K)	7 (63.64)	4 (36.36)	11
TOTALS	216 (65.26)	115 (34.74)	331

G = 9.0406 $X_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the stated primary goals of the music educators and the existence of a special string program. However, the greatest strength of that relationship exists in case III (H-I) goals where there is about a 50% "No" and a 50% "Yes" recorded. The strength lies in the predominance of "No" answers, i.e., "No," there is no string program for the other goals.

B 27.2 (See next page.)

B 27.2 Is there a relationship between the stated primary goals and who teaches the string program?

Who Teaches the String Program?

Stated goals	String Specialist (%)	Instrumental Specialist (%)	Some Other Teacher (%)	Total
I (A-B-C-D)	35 (49.30)	24 (33.80)	12 (16.90)	71
II (E-F-G)	3 (23.08)	8 (61.54)	2 (15.38)	13
III (H-I)	7 (30.44)	8 (34.78)	8 (34.78)	23
IV (J-K)	8 (80.00)	1 (10.00)	1 (10.00)	10
TOTALS	53 (45.30)	41 (35.04)	23 (19.66)	117

G = 13.2284 $X_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is a significant relationship between the stated primary goals and the person who teaches the string program.

B 27.3 Is there any relationship between the stated primary goals and the existence of an elementary orchestra in the music program?

Is There an Elementary Orchestra?

Stated goals	No (%)	Yes (%)	Total
I (A-B-C-D)	125 (69.83)	54 (30.17)	179
II (E-F-G)	40 (80.00)	10 (20.00)	50
III (H-I)	25 (59.52)	17 (40.48)	42
IV (J-K)	7 (70.00)	3 (30.00)	10
TOTALS	197 (70.11)	84 (29.89)	281

G = 4.6517 $X_c^2 = 7.81473$

The statistical analysis revealed that there is no significant relationship between the stated primary goals and the existence of an elementary orchestra in the music program.

APPENDIX G

INTERVIEWS WITH ELEMENTARY ADMINISTRATORS

TABLES

1. Interview sheet

   A 28.1 Raw data

   B 28.1 No statistical analysis

2. What is the administrative position held by the interviewee?

   A 29.1 Raw data

   B 29.1 No statistical analysis

3. For how many schools, etc., is the interviewee responsible?

   A 29.2 Raw data

   B 29.2 No statistical analysis

4. Does the interviewee agree with the investigator's thesis statement?

   A 29.3 Raw data

   B 29.3 No statistical analysis

5. What is the geographical distribution of the interviewees in relation to the administrative position held?

   A 30.1 Composite of raw data

   B 30.1 No statistical analysis

6. What is the geographical distribution of the interviewees in relation to the number of schools for which they are responsible?

   A 30.2 Composite of raw data

   B 30.2 No statistical analysis

7. What is the geographical distribution of the interviewees in relation to agreement with the investigator's thesis statement?

   A 30.3 Raw data

   B 30.3 No statistical analysis

8. What do elementary school administrators think is happening to elementary music education?

   A 31.1 Raw data

   B 31.1 No statistical analysis

9. What is the opinion of the interviewee about the investigator's thesis statement and other questions?

   A 32.1 Raw data

   B 32.1 No statistical analysis

10. What can be done to improve elementary music education?

   A 33.1 Raw data

   B 33.1 No statistical analysis

A 28.1 INTERVIEWS WITH ELEMENTARY ADMINISTRATORS

Date: ______________

(1) Administrative post: ______________ (2) District:* ______________

(3) School location: City ________________ State __________________

(4) Number of schools responsible for (elementary): __________________

(5) Number of pupils: __________ (6) Number of teachers: _____________

(7) Grade levels covered: Pre-Kindergarten ______; Kindergarten _____;

1 ______; 2 ______; 3 ______; 4 ______; 5 ______; 6 _____

(8) OPINION:

WHAT DO YOU THINK IS HAPPENING TO ELEMENTARY MUSIC EDUCATION?

DO YOU AGREE WITH THE INVESTIGATOR'S THESIS STATEMENT:

> Music education on the elementary level is declining at a very rapid rate at exactly the same time that new and innovational music programs are becoming more known and better understood. The music educator and those most responsible for the delivery of the music program seem inordinately "busy" with these new programs as well as occupied in intensified investigation of the subject matter of music.

THE QUESTIONS ARE:

Are you giving up elementary programs because of lack of funds?

Is it because new and younger teachers feel less adequate in music?

Do we need more specialists to help the classroom teacher?

In your particular situation, what could be done to bring more music education into the general elementary classroom? (Your opinion of problems and how we can resolve them will be deeply appreciated. Please use reverse, if you wish, for further comments.)

---

*Only the geographic region of the nation will be used.

Region of the United States	Interviewee number	A 29.1 Administrative position held:						A 29.2 Responsibility of the position:							A 29.3 Agreement w/ thesis?			
		Superintendent	Assistant Superintendent	Superintendent-Principal	Elementary principal	Principal-Teacher	Coordinator	Number of schools	Number of pupils	Number of teachers	Average class size	Pre-kindergarten through 6	Kindergarten through 6	First grade through 6	Agreement	Partial agreement	Disagreement	No response
Western	1				1			1	1,200	42	29	1				1		
	2						1	12	7,500	500	15		1		1			
	3				1			1	420	15	28	1			1			
	4				1			1	150	10	15	1			1			
	5		1					3	1,600	55	29		1		1			
	6				1			1	450	22	20		1				1	
North Central	7			1				1	600	30	20		1			1		
	8						1	1	600+	32	19		1		1			
	9						1	2	750	30	25	1				1		
	10				1			1	550	18	31	1			1			
	11	1						7	2,500	137	18		1		1			
	12					1		1	300	34	9		1		1			
	13				1			1	2,000	119	17		1				1	
	14	1						3	1,000	51	20		1					1
	15				1			1	674	37	18	1					1	
North Eastern	16	1						6	2,460	82	30		1			1		
	17				1			1	800	45	18		1					1
	18				1			1	300	16	19		1				1	
	19	1						5	1,200	42	29		1		1			
	20		1					4	1,200+	37	32		1			1		
	21				1			1	720	25	29		1				1	
	22	1						3	928	32	29		1			1		
	23				1			1	733	42	17*		1				1	
	24				1			1	650	30	22		1				1	
Southern	25				1			1	386	14	28			1	1			
	26				1			1	450	16	28			1		1		
	27			1				1	400	14	29		1		1			
Totals		5	2	2	14	1	3	63	30,521#	1,527		6	19	2	11	7	7	2
Percentages		18.51	7.40	7.40	51.85	3.70	11.11					22.22	70.37	7.40	40.74	25.92	25.92	7.40
															66.66			

*Summer

#Average pupil population: 484

PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

Region of the United States	A 30.1 Administrative position held:							A 30.2 Responsibility of the position:						A 30.3 Agreement w/thesis?			
	Superintendent	Assistant superintendent	Superintendent-Principal	Elementary principal	Principal-Teacher	Coordinator	Totals	Number of schools	Number of pupils	Number of teachers	Pre-kindergarten through 6	Kindergarten through 6	First grade through 6	Agreement	Partial agreement	Disagreement	No response
Western	0	1	0	4	0	1	6	19	11,320	644	3	3	0	4	1	1	0
North Central	2	0	1	3	1	2	9	18	8,974	488	3	6	0	4	2	2	1
North Eastern	3	1	0	5	0	0	9	23	8,991	351	0	9	0	1	3	4	1
Southern	0	0	1	2	0	0	3	3	1,236	44	0	1	2	2	1	0	0
Totals	5	2	2	14	1	3	27	63	30,521*	1,527	6	19	2	11	7	7	2
Percentages	18.51	7.40	7.40	51.85	3.70	11.11					22.22	70.37	7.40	40.74	25.92	25.92	7.40
														66.66			

*Average pupil population: 484

A 31.1	What do you think is happening to elementary music education?*
Region of the United States	
Western	1. "It seems to be becoming deemphasized in lieu of academic programs."
	2. "Declining."
	3. "Nothing in my district."
	4. "Phasing out."
	5. "In our district it is being curtailed because of financial problems."
	6. "Limited classroom instruction in upper elementary grades; little or no instruction in notation; mostly orchestra and singing in general."
North Central	7. "Nothing! That's the trouble."
	8. "Programs are being eliminated in some schools that are changing over to P.P.B.S. systems."
	9. "Not much change unless the program is being dropped because of funding."
	10. "Hard to get good teachers."
	11. "Like all the fine arts, it is lacking in proper funding."
	12. "It is declining."
	13. "Flourishing."
	14. "Losing out. No funds. We are not giving up, however."
	15. "In the ____________ District children are becoming more involved in music--both theory, exploration and instrumental. Creativity is greatly encouraged."
North Eastern	16. "Two things: suffering finance and capable teachers."
	17. "Being taken out of program of elementary schools."
	18. "Elementary Music Education programs have become more intensified. There is great emphasis on such programs as Orff and Kodály. Music educators are claiming that the new programs will facilitate a youngster's academic learning as well."
	19. "Music educators are not meeting needs of students."
	20. "Drastically cut in last ten years."
	21. "In my building the music curriculum is expanding and becoming more correlated with the total program."
	22. "It's in a plateau stage; nothing is happening."
	23. "In our particular school, there has been a lessening of skills in the vocal area. A multiplicity of materials and equipment are used to provide motivation, variety and enjoyment of music."
	24. "Strong program in our school."
Southern	25. "Unfortunately, it is going backwards."
	26. "Primary teachers are not trained in music education. Too much of the school day is 'reading'."
	27. "It's losing ground due to the fact that teachers feel inadequately prepared to teach music."

*Answers are numbered to correspond with list of interviewees in chart A 29.1, A 29.2, A 29.3.

PERSONAL INTERVIEWS (July-August, 1972)

Do you agree with the investigator's thesis statement?

Agreement: 11 (40.74%) Partial Agreement: 7 (25.92%)

Disagreement: 7 (25.92%) No Answer: 2 (7.40%)

Are you giving up elementary programs because of lack of funds?

Yes: 11 (40.74%) No: 15 (55.55%) No Answer: 1 (3.70%)

Is it because new and younger teachers feel less adequate in music?

Yes: 2 (7.41%) No: 17 (63.37%)

Partly: 3 (11.11%) No Answer: 5 (18.52%)

Are there enough music specialists "teaching" the elementary classroom music?

Yes: 9 (33.33%) No: 18 (66.66%)

Do we need more music specialists to "help" the classroom teacher?

Yes: 22 (81.48%) No: 5 (18.52%)

A 33.1	In your particular situation, what could be done to bring more music education into the general elementary classroom?
Region of the United States	
Western	1. "More music teachers." 2. "What we need is a time commitment to music by district; music should be of the 'now' generation; appropriately integrated; there is pressure to the icon of reading. We do not provide appropriate audiences commensurate with the great amount of time and work necessary for music skills; classes should exchange and perform for each other." 3. "Better in-service training. Most classroom teachers are not really teaching music; where there is a music specialist, there is no follow up. I think we must distinguish what is music education and what is music recreation. Time is a factor that must be corrected; if a teacher is going to cut anything, if they don't have enough time that day, the first thing they cut is music." 4. "Nothing." 5. "More funds. As the district grew, we did not add funds to provide for extra music teachers and there was too much work for those music teachers we had anyway. The end result is that there has been a cut-back on the amount of music that the children are getting." 6. "In-service in the elementary district; more opportunity for instrumental at primary grades; more music instruction at fourth, fifth, and sixth levels; specialists on call to help teachers develop programs."
North Central	7. "Nothing at the present time." 8. "(1) Hire an additional music teacher to work with self-contained classroom teachers; (2) Add music specialists to the Language Arts and Math Units." 9. "Classroom teachers and music teachers talking with each other on how their areas can complement each other; in return the classroom teacher can show interest in the music class." 10. "Lack of music room. Some schools in our district do not have specialists. Problems of substitutes in music (unqualified substitutes, chaos in the classroom, etc.); improve the working conditions for the music specialist and stabilize the music education program. Music teachers seem to be more capable in the cognitive areas than the affective areas ... my school is 20% affluent, 20% ADC and the rest in the middle. How to meet all the cultural patterns is a great problem for our music teachers." 11. "Until this year, 1971-72, I had good, adequate classroom instruction by a total of five music specialists. They were all released, however, in June due to a cut-back of $300,000 in the Educational Budget for the 1972-73 school terms." 12. "Our music program has been cut down because of lack of funds. Music should be taught by specially educated music teachers to achieve desirable results and not by classroom teachers who do not have sufficient training." 13. "Include specialists in this area (from the classroom corps) to embellish the music program. Make music a vocational program with directed motivation on the elementary level. " 14. "My reason probably will differ greatly from those in large systems. Since my school is rural our main problem is lack of funds. This is the only reason we do not have all the elementary music teachers we need." 15. No specific answer or suggestions by this administrator who outlined a very full program presently going on in the school, which has 65% white Appalachian and 35% black with many social problems. "Music is also trending toward individualization. In many areas it is becoming a part of the unified arts program. Usually the primary teachers teamed in providing music for the children." In this school there is a fulltime music specialist, a special music room to which all children come for 55-minute lessons about ten times a month; there are instrumental music specialists who

A 33.1

(continued) Region of the United States		
North Central		do all individualized instruction. Although there are vocal groups (glee clubs, choir) and combo groups, there is no orchestra.
North Eastern	16.	"Better training for music teachers so that they have more understanding of the child; less 'supervisory', egotistical, 'big shot,' great musician attitude; more interest in the individual student. We need music teachers, not administrators in the classroom music. (Bitter about his music supervisors not wanting to 'teach', spending too little time with the children.) The music teacher is the one who knows the most about music and spends the least amount of time with the children."
	17.	"Additional monies and staff, as well as better use of materials."
	18.	"Many elementary classroom teachers feel that children are getting more education by specialists than at any other time. Some are concerned about the amount of scheduled time for music."
	19.	"Make music educators more knowledgeable to needs of students."
	20.	"I had one music specialist in each school; now I have one music specialist for four schools, and since her discipline is very poor, this is an unsatisfactory situation. The children see her about two or three times a month and get very little in between--except those in the instrumental program. We have a good music man but he is handicapped by finances. We have no money for instruments and the children cannot afford to buy them. I would say our problem could be corrected with more music specialists and more music funds."
	21.	"We could use another fulltime teacher in order to include the kindergarten in the music program. At the present this is the responsibility of the classroom teacher."
	22.	"(1) Train the teachers to understand children first and how they can get their subject across second; last the skills in music; (2) Train the teachers to see their role as one of being part of the school, in 'tune' with the other teachers, understanding all the problems of the school; (3) Train the teachers to take pride in their contribution to the children as individuals; (4) Delete the "director's" role ... from music education! In our district we need good teachers, not more money. Our facilities are not being used adequately. Of course, we need some newer instruments and materials, but what we need most are fine, understanding music teachers."
	23.	"Encourage classroom teachers to follow through with the specialist's program and use more records, tape recordings. Provide young instrumentalists with opportunities to perform in class."
	24.	"In-service."
Southern	25.	"(1) Better trained, more inspiring, more modern music teachers; (2) More understanding of the music program on the part of the other teachers; (3) Greater cooperation between the music teacher and the other teachers; (4) More money!"
	26.	"More in-service Music Education to stress total importance to a pupil's well-being."
	27.	"To have at least one teacher assigned to your school who is strong in the area of music and build a music program so that he or she will be responsible for the total music program in the school; may be called 'team teaching'. Perhaps if we could encourage our administrators to give the principal more freedom to be flexible in assigning teachers in his or her school, and especially music, this would prove to be helpful in building stronger programs."

PERSONAL INTERVIEWS (July-August, 1972)

APPENDIX H

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

FACSIMILE

191 Orange Drive,
San Luis Obispo, California 93401
January 10, 1972

Dear Sir:

Would you kindly refer the following questionnaire to a member of your staff who is knowledgeable with regard to your present practice in the area of elementary MUSIC education? This questionnaire, easily returnable by folding in reverse and stapling, is an integral part of a doctoral study concerned with contemporary elementary MUSIC education in our free American public schools from PRE-kindergarten through grade 6. A prompt reply is vital to the study and will be most sincerely appreciated. Thank you and your staff member.

Youre truly,

(Mrs.) Florence Caylor

QUESTIONNAIRE

REGARDING THE SCHOOLS IN YOUR DISTRICT:

1. How many start with PRE-kgn.? _____ with kgn.? _____ with grade 1? _________
2. How many schools altogether through grade 6? _____ Music starts when? _______

REGARDING THE BASIC PHILOSOPHY OF YOUR MUSIC EDUCATION PROGRAM:

1. Modeled after an educational philosopher? _____ If so, who? _______________
2. Could you state briefly the basic MUSIC education philosophy? _____________

3. What are the chief goals?
4. What are the secondary goals?
5. How are these reflected in the program?
6. Is yours an innovational music program? _____ If so, how? _________________
7. Is there a need to upgrade your music program? _____ If so, what recommendations would you make?

REGARDING FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR YOUR MUSIC PROGRAM:

1. Have you had a state, federal, or other grant for music education? __________ If so, what kind? __________ For how long? _____ Is the program still functioning today? _____ If not, why not? ___________________________________

2. Does your present program need financial assistance? _____ If so, how would you use the money?

REGARDING THE TEACHER OF MUSIC IN YOUR ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS:

1. Does the regular classroom teacher teach the music? _____ A music specialist? _____ A music supervisor? _____ A music coordinator? _____
2. If it is the regular classroom teacher, does she get help? _____ From whom? ____________ Can she read music? _____ Play a musical instrument? ______ If so, which one? __________________ What musical background does she have?

REGARDING THE MUSIC LESSONS IN YOUR ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS:

1. Frequency of the lessons? ______________ Length of time of each lesson? ______________

2. What text(s) used?

   Correlated recordings available for each teacher? _________ Audio-vis.? _____
3. Is music reading taught? _____ By what method? __________________________ In what grade does it begin? __________ Frequency of lessons? ______ Time? ____
4. Is instrumental training taught? _____ At what grade level does it begin? _____

   Different instruments at different grades? _____ How? ________________ What method is used? ____________________ Who teaches the instruments? _____ ________________ Length of the lessons? ________________ Frequency? ________ Is there a special string program? __________ Who teaches it? ____________ When? ________________ Is there an elementary orchestra? __________ Elementary band? _____ How often does it rehearse? ________________ Does it appear in public? _____

   How often? ______________
5. Is there a special choral program? _____ What grades participate? ____________ Does it appear in public? _____ How often? ____________________

SEE REVERSE!

THANK YOU!

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Ajisaka, Tsugio. *Education by Dr. Obara*. Tokyo: Tamagawa University Press, 1960.

Ashton-Warner, Sylvia. *Teacher*. New York: Bantam Books, 1971.

Banfield, Edward C. *The Unheavenly City*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1968.

Bernstein, Leonard. *The Joy of Music*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1959.

Birge, Edward Bailey. *History of Public School Music in the United States*. Washington, D. C.: Music Educators National Conference, 1966.

Bloom, Benjamin S., David R. Krathwohl and Bertram B. Masia. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals. Handbook II: Affective Domain*. New York: David McKay Company, 1966.

Brogan, Peggy and Lorene K. Fox. *Helping Children Learn: A Concept of Elementary School Method*. New York: World Book Company, 1955.

Brown, L. M., (Ed.). *Aims of Education*. New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1970.

Bruner, Jerome S. *The Process of Education*. New York: Random House, 1963.

Bruner, Jerome S. *On Knowing: Essays for the Left Hand*. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Bruner, Jerome S. *The Relevance of Education*. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1971.

Clarizio, Harvey F. (et al.). *Contemporary Issues in Educational Psychology*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970.

Conant, James B. *The American High School Today*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.

Conant, James B. *The Education of American Teachers*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963.

Cooke, Deryck. *The Language of Music*. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Dewey, John. *Art As Experience*. New York: Capricorn Books, 1934.

Einstein, Albert. *Out of My Later Years*. New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams and Company, 1967.

Ellis, Henry C. *The Transfer of Learning*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1965.

Fabun, Don. *The Dynamics of Change*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Farnsworth, Paul R. *The Social Psychology of Music*. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1969.

Fleming, William. *Art and Ideas*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963.

Galbraith, John Kenneth. *The Affluent Society*. New York: The American Library (Mentor), 1958.

Galbraith, John Kenneth. *The New Industrial State*. New York: Signet, 1967.

Gardner, John W. *Excellence: Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too?* New York: Harper and Row (Perennial Library), 1961.

Gesell, Arnold and Frances L. Ilg. *Infant and Child in the Culture of Today*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1943.

Gesell, Arnold. *The First Five Years*. New York: Harper and Row, 1940.

Ghiselin, Brewster, (Ed.). *The Creative Process*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1952.

Gordon, Edwin. *The Psychology of Music Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Gross, Beatrice and Ronald Gross. *Radical School Reform*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969.

Guilford, J. P. *The Nature of Human Intelligence*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Helmholtz, Hermann L. F. *On the Sensations of Tone*. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1930.

Henry, Nelson B., (Ed.). *Basic Concepts in Music Education*. The Fifty-Seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Herron, William C. (et al.). *Contemporary School Psychology*. Scranton: International Textbook Company, 1970.

Hilgard, Ernest R. and Gordon H. Bower. *Theories of Learning*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.

Holt, John. *How Children Learn*. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1969.

Holt, John. *How Children Fail*. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1971.

Janson, H. W. and Joseph Kerman. *A History of Art and Music*. New York: Harry A. Abrams, Inc., 1968.

Jenks, Christopher and David Riesman. *The Academic Revolution*. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1968.

Jones, Archie N., (Ed.). *Music Education in Action*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1960.

Jones, Richard M., (Ed.). *Contemporary Educational Psychology: Selected Essays*. New York: Harper and Row (Harper Torchbooks), 1967.

Kallen, Horace M. *Cultural Pluralism and the American Idea*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1956.

Keller, Fred S. *Learning: Reinforcement Theory*. New York: Random House, 1954.

Kowall, Bonnie C., (Ed.). *Perspectives in Music Education: Source Book III*. Washington, D. C.: Music Educators National Conference, 1966.

Landis, Beth and Polly Carder. *The Eclectic Curriculum in American Music Education: Contributions of Dalcroze, Kodály, and Orff*. Washington, D. C.: Music Educators National Conference, 1972.

Langer, Susanne K. *Feeling and Form: A Theory of Art*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953. Chapter VIII, pp. 120-133.

Langer, Susanne K. *Philosophy in a New Key*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957. Chapter VIII, pp. 204-245.

Langer, Susanne K. *Problems of Art*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957. Chapters II, III, and IV, pp. 13-58.

Langer, Susanne K. An Introduction to Symbolic Logic. New York: Dover Publications, 1967. Chapters I, II, and III, pp. 21-81.

Langer, Susanne K. Mind: An Essay on Human Feeling, Volume I. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1970. Chapter I and V, pp. 3-32, 107-152.

Leeming, Joseph. It's Easy to Make Music. New York: Franklin Watts, 1948.

Leonard, George B. Education and Ecstasy. New York: Dell Publishing Company, Inc., 1968.

Leonhard, Charles and Robert W. House. Foundations and Principles of Music Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.

Lifton, Walter M., (Ed.). Educating for Tomorrow: The Role of the Media, Career Development, and Society. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1970.

Lurie, Ellen. How to Change the Schools. New York: Random House (Vintage Books), 1970.

Mahoney, Margaret, (Ed.). The Arts on Campus: Necessity for Change. Connecticut: New York Graphic Society Ltd., 1970.

McFarland, H. S. N. Psychological Theory and Educational Practice. London: Rontledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1971.

McLuhan, Marshall. The Guttenberg Galaxy. New York: Signet, 1962.

McLuhan, Marshall. Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.

McLuhan, Marshall and Quentin Fiore. War and Peace in the Global Village. New York: Bantam Books, 1968.

McLuhan, Marshall. From Cliche to Archetype. New York: The Viking Press, 1970.

Meyer, Leonard B. Emotion and Meaning in Music. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Montessori, Maria. The Montessori Method. New York: Schocken Books, 1964.

Mursell, James L. and Mabel Glenn. The Psychology of School Music Teaching. New York: Silver Burdett Company, 1931.

Mursell, James L. Human Values in Music Education. New York: Silver Burdett Company, 1934.

Mursell, James L. Music in American Schools. New York: Silver Burdett Company, 1943.

Neill, A. S. Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing. New York: Hart Publishing Company, 1959.

Nye, Robert E. and Vernice T. Nye. Music in the Elementary School. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957.

Palermo, D. S. and L. P. Lipsitt, (Eds.). Research Readings in Child Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963.

Piaget, Jean. Judgment and Reasoning in the Child. New York: Harcourt Brace and World, Inc., 1928.

Piaget, Jean. Six Psychological Studies. New York: Random House (Vintage Books), 1968.

Piaget, Jean. The Child's Conception of Time. New York: Ballantine Books, 1971.

Piaget, Jean. The Construction of Reality in the Child. New York: Ballantine Books, 1971.

Piaget, Jean. Science of Education and the Psychology of the Child. New York: The Viking Press, 1971.

Reimer, Bennett. A Philosophy of Music Education. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Repo, Satu, (Ed.). This Book Is About Schools. New York: Random House, 1970.

Revesz, G. Introduction to the Psychology of Music. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954.

Richardson, Elwyn S. In the Early World. New York: Random House, 1964.

Riesman, David (et al.). The Lonely Crowd: A Study of Changing American Character. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

Russell, Bertrand. A History of Western Philosophy. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1945.

Sandor, Frigyes, (Ed.). Musical Education in Hungary. London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1966.

Saylor, J. Calen and William M. Alexander. Curriculum Planning for Better Teaching and Learning. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1958.

Schwadron, Abraham A. *Aesthetics: Dimensions for Music Education.* Washington, D. C.: Music Educators National Conference, 1967.

Seashore, Carl E. *Psychology of Music.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1938.

Silberman, Charles E. *Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education.* New York: Random House, 1970.

Skinner, B. F. *Beyond Freedom and Dignity.* New York: Random House (Vintage Books), 1972.

Skinner, B. F. *Walden Two.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1972.

Slater, Philip. *The Pursuit of Loneliness: American Culture at the Breaking Point.* Boston: Beacon Paperbacks, 1971.

Smith, B. Othanel, William O. Stanley and J. Harlan Shores. *Fundamentals of Curriculum Development.* New York: World Book Company, 1957.

Snedecor, George W. *Statistical Methods.* Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1940.

Snyder, Keith D. *School Music Administration and Supervision.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1959.

Stevens, Halsey. *The Life and Music of Béla Bartók.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Suzuki, Shinichi. *Nurtured by Love.* New York: Exposition Press, Inc., 1969.

Tanner, Laurel N. and Henry Clay Ludgren. *Classroom Teaching and Learning: A Mental Health Approach.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1971.

Torrance, E. P. *Guiding Creative Talent.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Weigand, James, (Ed.). *Developing Teacher Competencies.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Wilson, A. Verne. *Design for Understanding Media.* New York: Summy Birchard Company, 1966.

Wilson, John A. R., Mildred C. Robeck and William B. Michael. *Psychological Foundations of Learning and Teaching.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.

Winslow, Robert and Leon Dallin. *Music Skills for Classroom Teachers.* Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Company Publishers, 1964.

B. MONOGRAPHS, GUIDES, PUBLICATIONS OF GOVERNMENT AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Andrews, Frances M. and Ned C. Diehl. "Development of a Technique for Identifying Elementary School Children's Musical Concepts," ED 016 517, ERIC, September, 1967.

Around the Corner: Preparing Today's Students to Meet Tomorrow's World Problems. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, No. 8081, 1967.

Arts and Humanities Program: Reports on Research Projects. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, OE 72-17, 1971.

Cady, Henry and Erwin H. Schneider. "Evaluation and Synthesis of Research Studies Relating to Music Education," ED 010 298, ERIC, 1965.

California State Board of Education: *Music Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve*, 1971.

Carpenter, Thomas H. "The Utilization of Instructional Television in Music Education," ED 032 788, ERIC, June 1, 1969.

Children and Their Primary Schools: A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education. (England). Volume I. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1967.

Constantino, Joseph C. (et al.). *Elementary Instrumental Curriculum.* Park Ridge, Illinois: Connetquot Central School District, 1967.

Creativity and Participation in Music Education, Bellflower Unified School District Report: ESEA Title III, Project No. 257. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1968.

Cultural Presentations: USA, 1967-68: A Report to the Congress and the Public by the Advisory Committee on the Arts. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, No. 8438, 1969.

De Yarman, Robert. *Elementary General Music: Curriculum Guide.* Iowa City Community School District Resource Guide, 1971.

Education in the Seventies. Washington, D. C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, OE-10051, 1968.

Educational Opportunity Bank: Report of the Panel on Educational Innovation to the U. S. Commissioner of Education. Washington, D. C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, August, 1967.

Ernst, Karl D. and Charles L. Gary. *Music in General Education*. Washington, D. C.: Music Educators National Conference, 1965.

Gary, Charles L. and Beth Landis. *The Comprehensive Music Program*. Washington, D. C.: Music Educators National Conference, 1973.

Glasgow, Robert B. "A Study to Determine the Feasibility of Adapting the Carl Orff Music Approach to Elementary Schools in America," ED 020 804, ERIC, May 27, 1968.

Gould, Oren A. "The Development of Specialized Programs for Singing in the Elementary Schools," ED 010 527, ERIC, 1966.

Guiding the Development of Musicality in Elementary School Children: ESEA, Title III, Project No. 66-1418, Madera, California, Project Reports, 1966, 1967; Final Report, 1968.

Half Our Future: A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education. (England). London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1966.

Hartsell, O. M. *Teaching Music in the Elementary Schools*. Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1963.

Keller, Wilhelm. *Einführung in Musik für Kinder*: *Orff Schulwerk*. Mainz, West Germany: B. Schott's Söhne, 1968.

Kendall, John D. *The Suzuki Violin Method in American Education*, Washington, D. C.: Music Educators National Conference, 1973.

Klotman, Robert H., (Ed.). *Scheduling Music Classes*. Washington, D. C.: Music Educators National Conference, 1968.

Learning to Learn Program: *Jacksonville, Florida*. Preschool Program in Compensatory Education. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969.

More Effective Schools: *New York City*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1970.

Murphy, Judith and George Sullivan. *Music in American Society*: *An Interpretive Report*. Washington, D. C.: Music Educators National Conference, 1968.

Music Objectives: *National Assessment*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1970.

PACE: Projects to Advance Creativity in Education (Funded from 1966 through 1968: Title III projects). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1969.

PACESETTERS in Innovation: Volume I, #2 (OE-20090) 1966; Volume I, #4 (OE-20094) 1966; and Volume II, #1 (OE-20101) 1967.

Petzold, Robert G. "The Perception of Music Symbols in Music Reading by Normal Children and by Children Gifted Musically," ED 002 899, ERIC, 1959.

Petzold, Robert G. "Auditory Perception in Musical Sounds by Children in the First Six Grades," ED 010 297, ERIC, 1966.

Pflederer, Marilyn. "How Children Conceptually Organize Musical Sounds," ED 028 200, ERIC, August, 1968.

Planning the Elementary Music Curriculum: Grades K-6. Columbia, South Carolina: State Department of Education, 1969.

Preparing Evaluation Reports: A Guide for Authors. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1970.

Preschool Programs in Compensatory Education: Fresno, California. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1970.

Richards, Mary Helen. *Threshold to Music*. Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1964.

Richards, Mary Helen. *Songs in Motion*. Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1965.

Richards, Mary Helen. *The Fourth Year*. Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1966.

Richards, Mary Helen. *Teaching Music Through Songs, Hand Singing, and Inner Hearing*. Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1966.

Rowen, Betty J. R. "An Exploration of the Uses of Rhythmic Movement to Develop Aesthetic Concepts in the Primary Grades," ED 020 770, ERIC, 1966.

(The) Scholar Looks at the Schools. Report of the National Education Association Disciplines Seminar. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1962.

Sessions, Roger (George Dickey). "An Enlarged Music Repertory for Kindergarten Through Grade Six," (Juilliard Study), ED 016 521, ERIC, December, 1967.

Thomas, Ronald B., Americole Biasono and Leonore Pogonowski. *Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program: Interaction*. Bardonia, New York: Media Materials, Inc., 1971.

Thomas, Ronald B. *Manhattanville Music Curriculum: Synthesis*. Bardonia, New York: Media Materials, Inc., 1971.

Widening Cultural Horizens Through the Performing Arts: Annual Report, Merced County Schools Office. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Project No. 67-04421-0, 1967-1969.

Yale Seminar on Music Education, Claude V. Palisca, (Ed.). *Music in Our Schools: A Search for Improvement*. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1964.

C. PERIODICALS

Andrews, Frances M., "Goals and Objectives for Music Education," *Music Educators Journal*, December, 1970, pp. 23-26.

Andrews, Frances M., "Responsibility for Change, Accountability for Progress," *Music Educators Journal*, May, 1971, pp. 26-30.

Bacon, Denise, "Kodály and Orff: Report from Europe," *Music Educators Journal*, April, 1969, pp. 53-56.

Balkin, Alfred, "Educators Must Face Reality," *Music Educators Journal*, March, 1972, pp. 35-36.

Choate, Robert A. and Max Kaplan, "Music in American Society: An Introduction to Issues," *Music Educators Journal*, April, 1967, pp. 42-51.

Choksy, Lois, "Kodály, In and Out of Context," *Music Educators Journal*, April, 1969, pp. 57-59.

Diserens, Charles M., "Reactions to Musical Stimuli," *The Psychological Bulletin*, 20: 173-199, April, 1923.

"Doctoral Dissertations in Music and Music Education, 1968-71," *Journal of Research in Music Education*, Volume 20, No. 1, Spring, 1972.

Flagg, Marion, "The Orff System in Today's World," *Music Educators Journal*, October, 1966, pp. 30-32.

Gaines, Joan, "What Do Community Leaders Say?" *Music Educators Journal*, January, 1970, pp. 30-40.

Gary, Charles L., reviewing: "Music and Art in the Public Schools," NEA Research Division Monograph, 1963, *Journal of Research in Music Education*, Volume XI, No. 2, Fall, 1963, pp. 146-147.

Gonzo, Carroll, "Aesthetic Experience: A Coming of Age in Music Education," Music Educators Journal, December, 1971, pp. 34-37.

Hanson, Howard, "The Arts in an Age of Science," Music Educators Journal, September-October, 1957, pp. 23-26.

Hearn, Norman E., "After Fund Cut-Offs," The Nations Schools, November, 1969, pp. 30-31.

Housewright, Wiley L., "Charge to the Commission," Music Educators Journal, October, 1970, p. 35.

Huff, Russell J., (Ed.), "How Superintendents See Themselves," The Nations Schools, November, 1969, pp. 35-37.

Keller, George C., (Ed.), "Music in American Education," Columbia College Today, New York, Volume XIII, No. 2, Spring, 1966, pp. 19-25.

Kilpatrick, Lula, "Classroom Teachers Can Teach Music!" Music Education for Elementary School Children, National Elementary Principal, December, 1959, pp. 11-13.

Kuhns, Richard, "Humanities as a Subject," The Journal of Aesthetic Education, Volume I, No. 2, Autumn, 1966, pp. 7-9.

Lehman, Paul R., "The Predictive Measurement of Musical Success," Journal of Research in Music Education. Volume XVII, No. 1, Spring, 1969, pp. 16-31.

Lehman, Paul R., "A Selected Bibliography of Works on Music Testing," Journal of Research in Music Education, Volume XVII, No. 4, Winter, 1969, pp. 427-442.

"Lip Service is Disservice without Action," (unsigned article), Music Educators Journal, January, 1970, pp. 53-55.

McQuerry, Lawrence H., "The Status of Elementary Special Music Teachers in California Public Schools," Journal of Research in Music Education, Volume XVIII, No. 4, 1969, pp. 416-422.

"Musical Competencies for Classroom Teachers," Music Educators National Conference Commission of Teacher Education, Music Educators Journal, May, 1971, pp. 40-42.

"The Music Specialist in the Elementary School," (A position paper prepared by the Music Educators National Conference Commission on Instruction), Music Educators Journal. November, 1972, pp. 60-62.

Picerno, Vincent J., "The Role of the Elementary Classroom Teacher and the Music Specialist: Opinions of the Music Supervisor," Journal of Research in Music Education, Volume XVIII, Summer, 1970, pp. 99-111.

Schoen, Max, "Tests of Musical Feeling and Musical Understanding," Journal of Comparative Psychology, 5: 31-37, February, 1925.

Schwadron, Abraham A., "Aesthetic Values and Music Education," Music Journal, May, 1964, pp. 42-44, 54-58.

Schwadron, Abraham A., "Musical Aesthetics: A Review and Critique," Music Educators Journal, February-March, 1965, pp. 69-71, 181-184.

Schwadron, Abraham A., "In Defense of the Special Music Teacher," Music Educators Journal, September-October, 1965, pp. 62-64.

Schwadron, Abraham A., "On Relativism and Music Education," Journal of Research in Music Education, Volume XIII, No. 3, Fall, 1965, pp. 131-135.

Schwadron, Abraham A., "Music and the Classroom Teacher," Music Journal, February, 1966, pp. 64, 78.

Schwadron, Abraham A., "The Tanglewood Symposium," Music Journal, September, 1968, pp. 40, 69-70.

Schwadron, Abraham A., "Some Thoughts on Aesthetic Education," Music Educators Journal, October, 1969, pp. 35-36, 79-88.

Schwadron, Abraham A., "Some Aesthetic Issues in Music Education," Arizona Music News, February, 1972, pp. 22-29.

Seashore, Carl E., "A Basis for Approach to Quantitive Studies in Aesthetics in Music," American Journal of Psychology, 39, 1927, pp. 141-144.

Thomson, William, "Music Rides the Waves of a Reform in Hawaii," Music Educators Journal, May, 1970, pp. 73-82.

Wersen, Louis G., Tanglewood Address partially quoted in Music Educators Journal, February, 1968, p. 42.

"Where Has All the Money Gone?" (unsigned article), Music Educators Journal, Volume 55, No. 5, pp. 66-72.

D. ARTICLES IN COLLECTIONS

Baensch, Otto, "Art and Feeling," *Reflections on Art*, Susanne K. Langer, Editor, pp. 10-36.

Brelet, Gisèle, "Music and Silence," *Reflections on Art*, Susanne K. Langer, Editor, pp. 103-121.

Britton, Allen P., "Music Education: An American Specialty," *Perspectives in Music Education: Source Book III*, Music Educators National Conference, pp. 15-28.

Britton, Allen P., "Music in Early American Public Education: An Historical Critique," *Basic Concepts in Music Education*, Nelson B. Henry, Editor, pp. 195-211.

Broudy, Harry S., "A Realistic Philosophy of Music Education," *Basic Concepts in Music Education*, Nelson B. Henry, Editor, pp. 62-87.

Castelnuovo-Tedesco, Mario, "Problem of a Song Writer," *Reflections on Art*, Susanne K. Langer, Editor, pp. 301-310.

Garvin, Lucius, "The Paradox of Aesthetic Meaning," *Reflections on Art*, Susanne K. Langer, Editor, pp. 62-70.

Gruber, Howard E., "Education and the Image of Man," *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, Richard M. Jones, Editor, pp. 89-102.

Kendall, John, "The Resurgent String Program in America," *Perspectives in Music Education: Source Book III*, Music Educators National Conference, pp. 394-401.

Kubie, Lawrence S., "The Forgotten Man in Education," *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, Richard M. Jones, Editor, pp. 61-71.

MacMurray, Foster, "Pragmatism in Music Education," *Basic Concepts in Music Education*, Nelson B. Henry, Editor, pp. 30-60.

Madison, Thurber N., "The Need for New Concepts in Music Education," *Basic Concepts in Music Education*, Nelson B. Henry, Editor, pp. 3-29.

Orff, Carl, "Orff Schulwerk: Past and Future," *Perspectives in Music Education: Source Book III*, Music Educators National Conference, pp. 386-399.

Szõnyi, Erzsébet, "Sol-Fa Teaching in Musical Education," *Musical Education in Hungary*, Frigyes Sandor, Editor, pp. 25-88.